

# THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the DEAN OF WINCHESTER, THE DEANERY, WINCHESTER, to whom  
all editorial matters should be addressed.

---

Vol. XXII

APRIL, 1931

No. 130

---

## EDITORIAL

AMONG the various criticisms and considerations called forth by the Lambeth Conference of last year, few in our judgment are more deserving of study than Mr. T. S. Eliot's *Thoughts after Lambeth*.\* The pamphlet has all the independence of judgment and the crispness of comment to which we are accustomed in the Editor of the *Criterion*; and these are combined with an understanding of the *ethos* of Anglicanism which makes it an important document of the Liberal Catholic position. Nowhere is this more apparent than in what Mr. Eliot has to say about Lambeth's handling of the moral issues before the Conference. As regards the substance of their findings on the question of Birth Control, he considers that "it was a courageous facing of facts of life; and was the only way of dealing with the question possible within the Anglican organization." But he goes on to make the important criticism that far too little emphasis was laid on the place of "spiritual advice" in the life of the ordinary Christian.

I do not suggest (he says) that the full Sacrament of Confession and Penance shall be imposed upon every part of the Church; but the Church ought to be able to enjoin upon all its communicants that they should take spiritual advice upon specified problems of life; and both clergy and parishioners should recognize the full seriousness and responsibility of such consultation. . . . But here, if anywhere, is definitely a matter upon which the individual conscience is no reliable guide; spiritual guidance should be imperative; and it should be clearly placed above medical advice. . . . In short, a general principle of the greatest importance, exceeding the application to this particular issue alone, might have been laid down; and its enunciation was evaded.

Mr. Eliot has mentioned a point of which the omission can still be made good; and we think that the Committee appointed at the last session of the Lower House of the Convocation of

---

\* *Criterion Miscellany*, No. 30. Faber and Faber. 1s. net.

Canterbury might well address itself in the main to this task. There are, of course, great difficulties. It is not simply that, as Mr. Eliot observes, there are differences of opinion among moralists as among doctors. What complicates things in the case of "spiritual advice" is that some confessors are not content to advise a rigorist line of conduct simply as what they themselves advise (as is the case with medical advice), but are prepared to insist on their advice as the sole teaching of "the Church," and to refuse absolution unless it is accepted. That is a position with which it seems to us impossible for any who hold the liberal view to come to terms. The issue of the right to refuse absolution on these *a priori* grounds represents in fact a prior question which must be settled before any approach to agreement among the clergy becomes possible. We believe, as we said in the December number of this journal, that an Anglican priest is not now entitled (even if he ever was) to refuse absolution on this ground; and we hope that all Liberal Catholics will be resolute on this point.

Few events in recent history have been more dramatic or more pregnant with hope for the future than the agreement to which Lord Irwin won the assent of Mr. Gandhi and his followers in the Indian Congress movement. It has been a triumph of Christian faith and character imposing itself on public policy and shaping it to the ends of peace, liberty, and good-will. Our history in India has been rich in examples of administrators who ruled "less by kingly power than love": but assuredly the name of none will shine with greater lustre than that of the Viceroy who now lays down the burdens of his office.

Mr. Eliot has mentioned a point of which the omission can still be made good; and we think that the Committee appointed at the last session of the Lower House of the Convocation of

## VIDEO MELIORA . . .

### THE THOUGHTS OF A PARISH PRIEST ON THE PROBLEM OF CHOICE

THE subject which is here considered is the parish priest's dealing, *in foro conscientiae*, with those very difficult questions which arise from the presentation of two courses of conduct, both alike evil in themselves, and the apparent necessity of choice between them. If anything here written serves, in however small a degree, to help clergy or people to think calmly and dispassionately about such questions, it will not have been written in vain.

It is an attempt to express thoughts full of awe and wonder at the mystery of life; thoughts long pondered; returning again and again; now repressed as being presumptuous, but now at last with many misgivings finding utterance in words, because conscience would seem to have it so.

The words which follow can only very imperfectly express the thoughts, and are no doubt, in places, in danger of being misunderstood. The writer would therefore ask for them the consideration and the charity of any who may think them unnecessary or uncalled for, or even perhaps exaggerated. And from all who read them he craves the indulgence which is due to any priest who tries to write about anything so tender and so sacred as the human soul in its awful relationship with the Creator and the Saviour and the Holy Spirit. Above all, he would say that he has tried to write humbly, feeling that the consideration of such a relationship can only be approached with the utmost humility, and with fear lest peradventure one day he who so writes should himself be "found to be a cast-away."

#### I

At the outset of what I am trying to say, I wish to set certain words of Holy Scripture, which are these:

(1) Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so.—*St. Matt. xix. 8.*

(2) He called every one of his lord's debtors unto him and said . . . How much owest thou unto my lord? And he said, An hundred measures of oil. And he said unto him, Take thy bill, and sit down quickly, and write fifty. . . . Take thy bill, and write fourscore.—*St. Luke xvi. 5-7.*

(3) For this thing I besought the Lord thrice, that it might depart from me. And He said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee: for my strength is made perfect in weakness.—*2 Cor. xii. 8, 9.*

(4) It is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands . . . two feet . . . two eyes to be cast into hell.—*St. Mark ix. 43 ff.*

(5) Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound.—*Rom. v. 20.*

Again and again one who has the cure of souls has to ask himself whether perhaps he may not be trying to exact obedience to a standard too high for these difficult and wayward times. There comes to him the fear lest, after all, change of circumstance and change of outlook and change of ideal may not demand a different standard from that of older days. And there come temptations to relax the demands of the Christian religion, not from any lack of reverence for those demands, but from a suspicion that perhaps we have grown wiser than our forefathers and have outgrown their ways of looking at moral questions, as most certainly we have outgrown their knowledge of material things. How if, after all, there is something, for instance, in this claim to liberty in the relationships of man and woman akin to the claim to liberty in the way of keeping Sunday? What and if we should be found guilty of binding upon men's shoulders burdens grievous to be borne, if we should forget that the Lord gave to the Church the authority not only to bind but to loose? These questions must be faced, but as we face them we must not let ourselves be misled by seeming parallels. Our Lord, it is true, did strip off the rigorous and merciless traditions by which the scribes had made the law itself of none effect. But when it came to the provisions of the law itself, His whole authority was thrown into the scale of severity and strictness; it was Corban that had to go, not the law of the fifth commandment. And where the law itself was concerned He went even further than Moses in the direction of strictness. Moses had suffered a laxity about divorce which infringed the primal law of marriage, and that primal law our Lord reaffirmed. In relation to what are sometimes called the counsels of perfection our Lord said, *ὁ δυνάμενος χωρεῖν χωρεῖτω*, but we are not told that He ever said that about His own "fulfilment" of the old law.

And we are stewards of our Lord, having to see that men pay to Him and to His law what He requires. We may not say, "Take thy bill and write fifty," when the hundred is due to Him. It does not rest with us to lower the demand even though we may believe that the Master Himself, their Master and ours, does deal very mercifully with those who have come short in what they owe to Him; the prerogative of mercy in all such cases is His, not ours, even though, when evil has been done, it may be that He will use us as the ministers of His own prerogative of mercy.

It is to this that all that goes before has been leading. It is not for us, His priests, to give license for breaches of the law; not for us to judge which of two evils may be the less; not for us to say that this is an exception which proves the rule. Yet we know that, the weakness of human nature being what it is, there will be breaches, there will be choices of one evil or the other, there will be exceptions to every rule. But in saying what we believe to be the law of God and the Church, are we to contemplate beforehand these breaches, these choosings, these exceptions? Are we to say that although, of course, the law is such, there are yet exceptions to it which we are prepared to condone? Are we, for example, to say that although the wilful taking of life is forbidden absolutely by the law of both Church and State, yet there will be cases in which the earthly judge, though actually passing sentence of death, may, in the belief that the circumstances were such as wellnigh to justify the deed, recommend the murderer to the gracious mercy of the King? Again, is not the law of the Church quite emphatic as to the refusal of Christian burial to a suicide, and yet are there not many cases where the presumption of insanity may be held to modify the refusal, at least in some particulars? Fr. Slater, of the Society of Jesus, well expresses the charity of the Church in such cases where he says of the insanity of a suicide, "and this the Church readily presumes."\* Once more the law of the whole Western Church, quite unequivocally expressed in the English Book of Common Prayer, is that divorce *a vinculo* is impossible; yet there will be cases where the Church's minister may have to point the way of repentance and consequent restoration to communion even where there is no longer possibility of amendment except in will.

The point of all this is that the Church cannot *legislate* for exceptions to her law, though she may have to deal with them as they arise, and that such exceptions are best dealt with each one on its own merits, no one case constituting precedent for another. It seems very dangerous to say in the abstract that there are cases which may be treated as exceptions, though it may be that in concrete instances a man or a woman may conscientiously believe that a choice of evils must be made. There is a saying which I have always believed to be a saying of the late Master of Balliol, Benjamin Jowett. Some question as to a choice of evils was proposed to him, and he was asked whether he would choose the one which was explicitly contrary to the law of God. And the Master replied, "I suppose I should, but I should not wish to think about it beforehand, or to justify it afterwards." May there not be cases about which it would be

\* *A Manual of Moral Theology*, vol. ii., p. 267.

wrong to legislate in the abstract beforehand; cases, too, which, though we could not justify afterwards, we might be very thankful to help to repentance and reconciliation?

There remains to be said the greatest thing of all. It concerns that which St. Paul calls the superabounding grace of God. When he is writing to the Romans\* of the abounding power of evil he is careful to tell them that where it does most abound there the grace of God is more abundant still. When thrice over he makes his petition to God† that some cross may be taken away from him, the answer that he receives is, Ἀρκεῖ σοι ἡ χάρις μου· ἡ γὰρ δύναμις ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ τελεῖται. Do we preach enough or teach enough about the power of God's grace, if only the soul will cast itself upon it? Do we consider enough the part which was played by the faith of the recipient in the working of our Lord's miracles? Are there not times when we have to tell people that if only they will believe they need have no fear? Μὴ φοβοῦ· μόνον πίστευε. And is it not true that very often, when a man is trying to persuade himself that he is justified in taking some lower course, there is really, at the back of his mind, something even more than a suspicion that he has no real need to take it, hard though it would be not to do so? A man professing to be greatly drawn to the religion of Mohammed frankly declared in a discussion that it was because he desired a lower ideal as to relationships with the opposite sex, and Mohammedan friends had persuaded him that their Prophet, coming so long after the Lord Christ, had been able to recognize the needs of a later time and to see the impossibility of a standard so high as that of the Christian religion. Yet the same man admitted to me afterwards, in a calmer moment, that he did not really think it impossible, and that he was not prepared to deny the dominant power of the grace of God. Was it Dr. Johnson who answered a man who had ended his plea for a low standard of life with the poor excuse, "After all, a man must live," with the words, "Sir, I don't see the necessity."‡ Surely that way sometimes lies the solution of our difficulties. Sometimes, though not always, there is no necessity, and to do the right at all costs receives its own reward. Sometimes a man has to be told that after all, even where there appears to be only the choice between two evils, and that one or other he must choose, there is yet a *tertium quid*, the third resource of the splendid exercise of self-restraint enabled by the superabounding grace of God.

\* Rom. v. 20.

† 2 Cor. xii. 8, 9.

‡ I have heard the same answer ascribed to Mgr. de Talleyrand, but it is much easier to hear Dr. Johnson say, "Sir, I do not see the necessity," than to imagine the free-thinking bishop reply, "Je n'en vois pas la nécessité," at any rate in answer to the same remark.

And when, as, alas! must often be the case, the wrong thing is done, the lower course taken, it is the duty of the Church not to condone it, but to point the way to penitence and peace. The priest cannot say to the penitent, "I think in your case the thing was quite justified by the circumstances amidst which you found yourself." Rather, he is bound to say, "The thing that you have done was wrong, but, by the mercy of God, there is always the way of repentance, the 'miracle of repair.' Let us set out to find that way."

Whatever may be the meaning of the terribly severe words of the Epistle to the Hebrews\* as to the renewal of the sinner after post-baptismal sin, we may be thankful that the Church did not so understand them as to deny the possibility of repentance even after deadly sin, or, if she did so understand them, she saw fit to relax their severity in her own system of dealing with the penitent sinner. And we may also bear in mind the warning of the Blessed John Keble that we are not to understand Esau's failure to find repentance, seeking it though he did carefully with tears, "as parallel to anything on this side the grave."†

"Video meliora, proboque"; the Christian priest has to try to keep himself, and, so far as he can, those to whom he ministers ἐν προσώπῳ Χριστοῦ, from ever finishing that saying of the Roman poet.‡

H. V. S. ECK.

## ON THE GIVING OF PENANCE

SATISFACTION—that is, "the imposition of a penance by the priest in confession, and its acceptance by the penitent"—§—is an essential part in all true repentance. This is so because all sin committed by individuals is at the same time sin against the Body of Christ as well as sin against God. Hence confession is made to an officer of that Body, one to whom God "hath given power and commandment . . . to declare and pronounce to his people, being penitent, the absolution and remission of their sins."|| By the sacrament of penance the penitent receives remission of all the eternal consequences due to his sins, but it by no means follows that he escapes the temporal consequences. And the Church, through her priests, has the right to impose "temporal punishment" in view of the fact that she has lost power as a direct consequence of the sin which has been committed. She does this, not with any idea of vindictiveness,

\* Heb. xii. 17.

† *Christian Year*, Lent. II.

‡ Ovid, *Met.*, 7, 18.

§ Belton: *A Manual for Confessors*, p. 74.

|| Book of Common Prayer.

but rather with the sense of strengthening the sinner in such a way that his future life may be more in accordance with the life of holiness which runs through the whole Body. To change the metaphor—the priest is not the surgeon performing an operation on the diseased member for the sheer pleasure of inflicting pain. Rather he operates with the ultimate intention of purifying the life of the Body. Hence it follows that the imposition of penance is a medicinal undertaking, and, as far as is possible, penance should be given with this purpose in view.

Canon Pym, in his *Spiritual Direction*, says: "The 'how' of confession should not be kept in the ecclesiastical or legalistic arena, but should be transferred to that of spiritual therapeutics or of psychology."\* This is an over-statement, because of what the Church is, but it contains an element of truth, a truth sometimes forgotten by priests of today when they are imposing a penance. Too often the penance has little or no connection with the confession which preceded it. Too often the penance is given in a mechanical or formal manner, merely to satisfy the tradition that penance should always be given with absolution. As Canon Pym remarks, "It seems a pity to introduce anything of a purely formal nature into a ministry which, apart from the formality of a light conventional penance, is so significant. To many penitents this objection is important; they would be glad to avail themselves, and perhaps do avail themselves, of this ministry, but regret the one part of it which lacks any realistic significance."† Once again there is an element of truth in this statement, but when Canon Pym goes on to say that the imposition of a penance may sometimes be "useless or even injurious," he solves the knot only by cutting it. His difficulty is that he confuses throughout his whole book the formal use of the sacrament of penance and spiritual advice given apart from the confessional; as again when he suggests that "discipline," or rather its form, could be suggested by the penitent himself. Any priest who hears confessions regularly knows the great danger that lies in a practice such as this, whereas when advice is being given apart from the confessional, there is a real value to be found in urging the person concerned to suggest what is, after all, a rule of life.

Another weak spot which Canon Pym exposes in much of the modern method of giving penance, Roman as well as Anglican, is found in the following words. He says, "It is possible, and, unfortunately, too common, for penitents to return to confession again and again with the same sins each time and in the same degree; and there are confessors who ignore the significance of this. They continue to give absolution, and to lay down a

\* T. W. Pym: *Spiritual Direction*, p. 90.

† *Ibid.*, p. 92.

penance. The latter is performed, and the penitent by degrees becomes insensible to the fact that no improvement in his life is being effected."\* What we have to remember today, and what some confessors seem to have lost sight of, is the fact that "the grace of forgiveness is dynamic. . . . To be forgiven of God is not merely to be brought from handicap up to scratch and left there, but to be sent over the scratch-line with a flying start; it is not simply to receive a clean slate, but to receive it inscribed with the words 'New Life.' God's forgiveness is more than reconciliation; it is propulsive power."† While penance in itself must not be confused with mapping out a line of conduct for the future, yet it must fit into its proper place in that new life to which the penitent has pledged himself in his confession. Indeed, Dr. Kirk declares that the object of penance is "to fix and concentrate the new aspiration for holiness in some special act of service or devotion."‡ Confession and penance together form what Dr. Kirk calls a "declaratory act" which "should signalize each new access of grace, each new token of divine love or providence, by a new offering of (the soul) to God, expressed first and foremost—as was its original dedication of itself—by something outward and irrevocable."§

Another difficulty which confronts priests—especially as in so many cases they receive far too little training for this side of their ministry—is how to help their people use the sacrament of penance as a way of holiness. Too often our people have an idea that sacramental confession is good in cases of grave—by which they often mean dramatic—sins, whereas for the ordinary person who is not tempted to commit adultery, murder or theft, this sacrament, and certainly the repeated use of this sacrament, is of little use. And it is to be feared that the ministrations of some confessors have not helped much to dissipate this false idea. Little effort is sometimes made to inculcate a desire for *perfection*, or to help the soul in those higher realms of spiritual devotion which often remain a sealed book, an uncharted sea with the vaguest of landmarks, to multitudes of our people.

There is still another matter which calls for earnest thought on the part of confessors, and this is the giving of "ghostly counsel and advice."|| I am well aware that this is secondary to the grace of absolution, and that it is not a necessary part of the sacrament of penance. But where such counsel is given, it should be to the point. And "everything should be referred to God."¶ "Fr. X. is a wonderful confessor," said a penitent "He doesn't say much when I have finished my confession; but

\* *Ibid.*, p. 94.

† *Ibid.*, pp. 94-95.

‡ K. E. Kirk: *Some Principles of Moral Theology*, p. 120.

§ *Ibid.*

|| Book of Common Prayer.

¶ Belton: *op. cit.*, p. 162.

he makes me feel an ungrateful worm, and he leaves me looking at God."

If the truth must be told, it would seem that we confessors, while we have some knowledge of the Way of Purification, have less of the Way of Illumination, and practically none of the Way of Union. And often we retard souls whom God is calling to the higher ways, because we ourselves have no compass with which to direct them.

I would like to submit, therefore, for the consideration of all who may read this article, that a great deal can be done to meet some of these difficulties, if more penances were given and more direction were based on the words to be found in our official services and recorded for our use in the Book of Common Prayer. If this were done, then certain advantages follow at once.

First, we come into immediate touch with those better known portions of the New Testament which the genius of the Church—which is another way of referring to the Holy Spirit of God—has found best suited for directing men's thoughts and aspirations to God. Here, if anywhere, we can find the divine urge to holiness translated into terms of thought. The teachings and commands of our Blessed Lord must form the basis of every spiritual advance of the soul; while in the apostolic commentaries—the Epistles—we find that divine urge being worked out in contact with the actual conditions under which the first Christians lived. I find it very difficult to think that their problems were, in essence, very much different from those of our own time.

Again, we bring our people into real and vital contact with the need for that lost Christian art and work of piety, Bible reading. If people have ceased to read their Bibles, it is because they have found no connection between the words they have read and their own lives as they have to live them from day to day. They have read without understanding, without real application, without discrimination. In days when that false doctrine of verbal inspiration has vanished, there has been no true doctrine of inspiration to take its place. But in those extracts from the New Testament which appear in the Prayer Book, we do find the emphasis laid on just those parts which are most vital in the Scriptures, and we find, too, the highest ideals and aspirations of the New Testament "collected" into those gems of English devotion, the Prayer Book Collects, often in the very words of the New Testament itself. If these parts can be made the basis of direction and given as a penance of prayer or meditation, they can be made to live more than ever before in the minds of our people. A penitent who has just made his confession is naturally in the best possible condition

for the reception of the Word of God, and often I have found that a short sentence from the New Testament has been an illuminating advice in itself, and a penance which does "fix and concentrate the new aspiration for holiness" that presumably has brought the penitent to the confessional. It comes into his mind again and again, it is met with in public worship, it is found in private reading of the Bible—and thus is seen in its proper context—and each time it comes into the mind it brings with it a renewal of that moment when the penitent said, "I heartily purpose to amend."

Further, these words, coming through the medium of the Prayer Book, come to the penitent "hot with the breath of twice ten thousand saints." It is astonishing how little the sense of fellowship or "corporateness" is to be found, even amongst practising Catholics. And this means that the personal work of the Holy Spirit through the Body of Christ is little appreciated and still less used. But, in receiving a penance from the Prayer Book, the penitent can be made more conscious of this work of the Holy Spirit. He finds that his prayer is given him by the work of the Spirit, he finds that thousands and millions have also used this prayer, and he learns to realize that "God hath spoken by His Son," and that the Church has re-echoed that voice down through the centuries that separate him from the lanes of Galilee and the streets of Jerusalem. This is what has given the Psalms their unique and peculiar importance and position in Christian devotion.

We are only too familiar with the spectacle of a congregation in Church uttering words and singing hymns to which their daily lives give the lie direct. It may not be their fault. They have not learned to connect their worship with their lives. But five minutes' meditation on the words, "Let this mind be in you," will make a tremendous difference to a man's worship on Palm Sunday, when he hears these words coming to him from the altar in the Epistle for the day. And if those five minutes have been spent immediately after his confession and declared purpose of amendment, they will bear even more fruit when the penitent hears the words once more. Can we not, then, in our advice and in our imposition of penance, help our people learn the reality of worship?

In basing counsel upon or giving penance from the Prayer Book, care must naturally be taken that the meaning of the passage is understood by the penitent. It may even be necessary to go over the penance with the penitent before giving absolution. Some may object that penances from the Prayer Book are suitable only for people who have reached a certain level of education or are gifted with an unusual amount of intelligence.

This objection falls to the ground in view of the fact that we expect all our people to understand these words when they hear them in public worship. In any case, what better place can be found in which to explain the meaning of the Prayer Book than the confessional? Readers of Prebendary Denison's *Prayer Book Ideals* will realize that the Prayer Book has some very definite ideals of worship and life to set before us, and also that there is widespread ignorance on what the Prayer Book really means. It will not be a useless rider if a greater understanding of the Prayer Book is a secondary result of giving penances from that book.

The best text-book of spiritual therapeutics is the New Testament; the home of spiritual therapeutics is the Holy Catholic Church; the method of spiritual therapeutics is Catholic worship—*Sursum Corda*. Cannot these three agree in one and be applied to the individual soul in counsel and penance?

R. H. LE MESSURIER.

## THE RESURRECTION

THE purpose of this article is to try and disentangle some of the more important issues which confront Christian thought today in regard to the resurrection. They are issues which concern very closely our conception of what is involved in the Church's Easter message, and to a lesser degree our ideas of death and immortality. And they have been brought before us recently in three striking books to which we are glad to draw attention. The earliest of them is the Dean of Chester's *The Resurrection of the Dead*,\* which has already been the subject of a notice in THEOLOGY. Like his earlier book *Expecto*, it represents an attempt to work out a Christian eschatology against the background of an evolutionary philosophy. Not long afterwards appeared the late Dr. Charles's *The Resurrection of Man*,† consisting of sermons preached in Westminster Abbey. Many of the sermons are unconnected with the subject which gives the book its title; there are four, for instance, on Jeremiah, and three on John Wycliffe. Suffice it to say of them that they are marked by all the author's accustomed earnestness and erudition. We shall not be wrong, however, if we assume that it was to the earlier sermons in the book, and especially to the first five (to each of which he appended a synopsis in the Table of Contents), that Dr. Charles himself attached the greatest importance.

\* Chapman and Hall. 1929. 5s. net.

† T. and T. Clark. 1929. 7s.

They are, and were meant to be, provocative. The third book before us contains a series of Christological studies by British and German theologians published under the title *Mysterium Christi*.\* It is a book of quite exceptional importance, especially on the New Testament side; the contributions of Gerhard Kittel, Hermann Sasse, and Sir Edwyn Hoskyns, in particular, form a trio with which all serious modern theologians must reckon. Among these Pastor Sasse's essay, entitled "Jesus Christ the Lord," is largely devoted to the resurrection; and it is one of the most significant things written on the subject in recent years.

### I.—THE JEWISH BACKGROUND

Of no Christian doctrine is it more true than of the resurrection that its meaning and content are only to be determined by careful attention to its origin in the history and religion of Judaism. In sharp contrast to the prevailing Greek idea, borrowed from Orphism, of the immortal soul being liberated at death from the body in which it had been entombed, Jewish hope, true to its idea of man as "a psycho-somatic unity," envisaged a life after death which included body as well as soul, and which depended not on man's inherent title to immortality, but on an act of God. Moreover, as Sasse has shown, that is not all that has to be said. In prophetic religion (*i.e.*, Parseeism, Islam, and Judaism, as well as Christianity) the resurrection is a cosmic event, which happens at the end of history. "It happens at the end of the world and heralds the beginning of a new creation"; and no less than the creation of the world itself, it depends on the creative activity of God.† The resurrection is "the summoning of the whole man, soul and body, from death to life in the spirit." That the prophetic, Jewish and Jewish-Christian, doctrine of resurrection is thus eschatological and not philosophical is no accident, but is part and parcel of that emphasis on history which is so characteristic both of Judaism and of Christianity. Where they differ is not primarily in their conceptions of resurrection, but in their conceptions of history: Christians believing, the Jews denying, that the end of history is already present in Christ, the new age begun, and the new creation inaugurated.

We must, however, discriminate. Even among the Jews themselves during the four centuries before our era there were different ways in which the resurrection was conceived; and

\* Edited by the Bishop of Chichester and Dr. Deissmann. Longmans. 1930.

† Note the fact that the verb commonly used in N.T. to express "rising" from the dead, in our Lord's case as in that of Christians, is not the active *ἀναστῆναι*, but the passive *ἐγερθεῖν*: the dead "is raised" rather than "rises."

a further and more significant difference was introduced by Christianity under the influence of belief in the resurrection of Jesus and in the power and presence of the Holy Spirit. In its primitive form the Jewish idea of the resurrection was closely connected with their idea of the Kingdom of God, which was to be established *upon earth*. Resurrection, therefore, was inevitably conceived in what we should now regard as a materialistic form. The hope of the righteous after death lay in membership of the kingdom: the kingdom was to be set up on earth: therefore those who rose must rise with their bodies, if they were to take part in it. Some of the Rabbis even taught that a Jew must be buried in Palestine, or at least (if that was impossible) with his feet turned towards that land, if he wished to be sure of sharing in the resurrection.\*

Within this general eschatological scheme, however, there was room for considerable divergence of opinion as to details; and we find such divergence asserting itself as to the duration of the kingdom, its *locale*, its relation to the resurrection, the scope of the resurrection itself, and its relation to the judgment. Some continued to hold, for example, the view that the kingdom would be eternal on earth; but others held that this earthly kingdom would be only transitory (the millennial theory), and make way for an eternal kingdom in a new heaven and new earth; while others went still further and omitted the earthly kingdom altogether. In some circles, indeed, and notably in Alexandrian Judaism, even the new heaven and earth were dispensed with, and resurrection was of spirits only—a development which shows the invasion into Judaism of Greek ideas. We need not, however, go further into these detailed divergences. It will suffice if we say that Jewish eschatological beliefs at the opening of our era fall into three distinct divisions, which may be classified as follows:

(1) The belief that the kingdom would be established on this earth, probably in Palestine, and that the righteous would be raised from the tombs with their bodies to take part in it: a belief which is clearly attested among the Pharisees and others of our Lord's day (*cf.* Mark xii. 23; Luke ix. 8; Mark vi. 14).

(2) The belief that the kingdom would come, with or without a "millennium" intervening, in a new and transformed cosmic order, to which the righteous would rise clothed in garments of light and glory.

(3) The belief that there would be a resurrection of the spirit only: the belief of Jubilees and the Psalms of Solomon i.-xvi., as well as of more definitely Hellenistic books such as Wisdom, Philo, and 4 Maccabees.

\* Charles, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

Now these were the three conceptions of the resurrection available to any Jew or proselyte in the period underlying the earliest documents of the New Testament; and obvious importance attaches to the reasons which led to the use or development of any one of them by the earliest teachers of the Christian Church. The first of them was perhaps not far from the mind of the disciples who asked the question, "Wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" (Acts i. 6): but it was inconsistent with our Lord's rejection of nationalism, and was expressly disavowed by Him when replying to the Sadducees (Mark xii. 25). The third was clearly in St. Paul's mind when writing 1 Cor. xv.; but he carefully avoids it and indeed enunciates a doctrine of resurrection inconsistent with it. If we ask what led the Apostle thus to reject a doctrine which was taught in literature that he certainly valued and often used,\* and which would undoubtedly have commended itself to his readers at Corinth and his hearers at Athens, the answer would seem to be partly that it would not have enabled him to do justice to the vital element of historical fact in the Gospel. As Sasse has shown, it was just this which caused such offence in St. Paul's preaching of the resurrection at Athens. The Athenians would not have objected to his preaching Orphic ideas of immortality: nor would they have objected to his preaching a "resurrection" of Jesus which was avowedly as mythical as that of Attis or Osiris. What was really scandalous was that he proclaimed a resurrection of Jesus which he said had *really occurred*! It was the history, the fact, that was the offence. But if the chief thing that St. Paul had to proclaim was a historical fact, then no form of the Hellenic or Hellenistic conception of immortality would have sufficed. He would have found himself proclaiming not a historical fact, but a philosophical belief; and in so doing he would have been betraying his apostleship.

But there was a further cause operating in conjunction with this; and it appears to account equally for St. Paul's handling of the second of the three types of doctrine available to him. That cause was his conception, derived from eye-witnesses and from his own experience, of the resurrection of the Lord Himself. Superficially the idea of resurrection embodied in 1 Cor. xv., 2 Cor. v., and Phil. iii. 21, has affinities with that second type found in Jewish apocalyptic: in particular, they are at one in the belief that resurrection implies the transformation to a more glorious mode of being. But the differences are no less significant. Not only are millennarian ideas almost certainly absent from St. Paul's writings, but the grotesque elements so notice-

\* Cf. Charles, *The Book of Enoch*, pp. 45 ff.

able in some of the Jewish apocalyptic writings are pared away; while even the most distinctive feature of this Jewish doctrine, its emphasis on "light" as the vesture of the risen righteous, which might have seemed congenial to St. Paul after his experience on the Damascus road, plays no part worth mentioning in his teaching about the resurrection. At the same time the contrast between this life and the next is underlined and deepened; and the transformation from the one to the other is given a concreteness, actuality, and precision which seem to point to a historical rather than a doctrinal origin.

It appears legitimate to infer from this that, just as in general the historical fact of Christ's resurrection and of the new creation it inaugurated ruled out, for St. Paul, the adoption of any Greek idea of immortality, so a more particular knowledge of what Christ's resurrection had involved accounts for the particular form which his teaching on resurrection takes. So far, in fact, from St. Paul's idea of the resurrection of believers being arrived at from his Jewish training and then being applied by him and by others to the Lord's resurrection, this idea itself presents features which mark it off sharply from any earlier or contemporary Jewish ideas, and which are most easily explained as being derived from the Apostle's conception of what the Easter message really involved for Jesus. We have, that is to say, in St. Paul's teaching about the resurrection in general, important indications as to how he conceived of our Lord's resurrection.

I have given elsewhere\* reasons for believing that the resurrection of our Lord involved on the one hand the empty tomb, and on the other the transformation of our Lord's human life, including His body, into a new mode of being; and Mr. Mascall, in the article which follows this, discusses at greater length the meaning and reasonableness of such a belief. I cannot, however, leave the subject without adverting to an important passage in Dr. Bennett's book,† where emphasis is laid on the relevance of the Transfiguration to the subject before us. Rightly insisting on the significance of the Greek word *μετεμορφώθη*, translated in our Bible "was transfigured," Dr. Bennett urges that "the Transfiguration reveals to us . . . what should have been and would have been reached by our human race as the normal method of passing on, had our race not diverged from the purposed line of its evolution. In the person of our Lord perfectly evolved man needed not to die." In other words, Dr. Bennett would have us see in the Transfiguration an anticipation of the

\* In *Essays Catholic and Critical*, and in *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture*, art. "The Evidence of the Resurrection."

† *The Resurrection of the Dead*, pp. 156 ff. And cf. Mark ix. 9, 10.

risen and glorified life which our Lord won through death, and into which He calls all who believe in Him. The suggestion is one that merits careful thought.

## II.—HISTORY AND FAITH

What is "of faith" in regard to our Lord's resurrection? It is one thing to be satisfied in one's own mind that the resurrection of Jesus meant for the writers of the New Testament his rising from an empty tomb: it is another to assert as part of the Church's faith that it can mean no less. The question is raised in an acute form by Dr. Kittel's essay, "The Jesus of History," in *Mysterium Christi*. The indispensable tension, on which von Hügel often dwelt, between the claims of faith and the rights of historical criticism has never been more powerfully exemplified than it is here; and if it compels us to enlarge somewhat our ideas of what is meant by orthodoxy, the corrective it administers to Modernism is even more far-reaching.

Dr. Kittel's first point is that the whole New Testament—those parts which are doctrinal and hortatory no less than those which are historical in form—is dominated by an overwhelming belief and interest in a concrete history. "It tells of a 'miracle' in the strict and proper sense of the word. *The Word became flesh*, that is to say, what is eternal became historical, accidental, and miserably insignificant, and this poor and trivial contingency contains that particularity which only One can claim—God Himself." In reply to those who try to escape the problem by concentrating on the unique sublimity of Christ's ethical teaching, Kittel points out that it is embedded in "a passionate eschatology," which causes it to compare ill with the more rounded systems of a Plato or a Buddha; while many of our Lord's most striking teachings, often claimed to be His alone, can be paralleled elsewhere. No, what is unique is Jesus Himself, the concrete Person who lived, died, and rose again. That is why there runs through the New Testament so strong an emphasis on eye-witness—an emphasis which makes itself felt so plainly in St. Paul's words, "of whom the greater part remain until now" (1 Cor. xv. 6). Far stronger in the first century than any of those legendary or mythopœic tendencies so facilely attributed to that age by Modernism was the simple, yet dominating, desire to find out what really happened and to be sure that it was true. The climax of the process is to be found in the Johannine writings, where "with a harshness that cannot be surpassed the mark of those who possess the Spirit of God is declared to be their confession that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh (1 John iv. 2 f.)." "The

recognition that the Christ who now meets the believer is identical with the Historical Jesus involves the Sonship of God, and Salvation is to encounter Him whom the eye-witnesses saw as the Jesus of History."

But this passionate interest in history does not preclude the work of criticism: rather, it sharpens its tools. Criticism, indeed—as St. Luke's preface shows—was already at work in the age when the New Testament was being written, and even before the writing of it began. The criticism of today, no doubt, employs a more scientific method than was available in the first century: but it may well learn from that generation what its true aim must always be, namely, the discovery of what really happened. That said, however, the inevitable contingency of all historical evidence and reconstruction must be faced. In taking upon Himself our flesh and so committing Himself to history, God entered into the contingent; and Christian faith in the Incarnate cannot dispense itself from this element of contingency. In this sense there is "no single *Logion* of Jesus, no recorded action of His, which is not open to doubt." Yet to be open to doubt is not the same thing as to be unhistorical. Of many of the modern pictures of the historical Jesus which profess to have eliminated from the story all that is out of tune with current ideas of what might happen it can only be said "that, whatever may be the truth, this cannot be." Even what is unhistorical is not necessarily to be deleted from the historical picture; for it belongs to a larger whole, and it is in relation to that whole that it must be judged. And, broadly speaking, that whole meant for the New Testament writers without exception something that was at once "Word" and "Fact." To be a believer was to hear through the "Fact" the "Word," to grasp through the contingent the eternal, to see in the Jesus of history the Son of God, and in the Cross salvation.

It is from that standpoint—a standpoint which it is very difficult for any honest, truthful mind to repudiate—that the question with which this section opened must be answered. Indeed, for Kittel as for Sasse, our Lord's resurrection presents the supreme example of the tension we have been describing. It is rightly observed that of the resurrection itself we have no account. No one saw it: what they saw was the risen Lord, and, if report be trusted, His grave untenanted. Sasse clearly thinks this report an afterthought of faith: Kittel thinks it impossible to harmonize the resurrection narratives, which to the pure historian as such can only appear as "strange, impossible, irrational fragments." Yet none can read these two essays without being convinced that both authors are

believers in the resurrection, and would have been so accounted in the first century. Is the citadel of faith, then, at the mercy of Modernism? Or are the marches of orthodoxy widened?

### III.—THE ISSUE WITH MODERNISM

The answers to the questions just asked will be plain if the two essays we have been considering be compared with Dr. Charles's *The Resurrection of Man*. Dr. Charles was acclaimed as a Modernist, even if he did not claim to be one, and the book before us is a representative statement of the Modernist view of the resurrection, both of Christians and of Christ. What is it that differentiates his position from that of Kittel and Sasse? The answer lies along two lines, historical and doctrinal.

1. To speak of history at all in connection with Dr. Charles's sermons is perhaps a misnomer; for his main, if not his only, interest is to win assent to the particular theory of human immortality that he has embraced. That very fact, however, is significant. The fifth sermon in this book affords a striking example of how far blindness to the place of the historical in the New Testament and in the Christian faith can go. And yet the blindness is not, perhaps, quite complete: there is a crudeness, a fanaticism, in Dr. Charles's treatment of our Lord's resurrection which suggests an uneasy awareness of much more in it than he cares to admit or wishes others to suppose. *Historiam expellas furca: tamen usque recurret*. Possessed of a Manichean horror of the body, He cannot allow for a moment "the gross conception of an empty tomb." Convinced that the Easter message involves condemning our Lord "to an imperfect and mutilated personality," he claims that the "third day" measures, not the duration of the Lord's entombment, but the slowness of the disciples in realizing the truth. Intolerant of miracles as "unintelligible occurrences," he can find no room for any feature in our Lord's resurrection which is not normal in ours. But let us quote his own words:

But, if the faithful, as our Lord and St. Paul taught, have already risen more or less in their complete personalities, then a further conclusion follows, and this is, that Christ had no further relation with His physical body after His death on the cross. His personality was not mutilated for a moment. The *mere physical* body had, as the narratives of the Resurrection show, when tested critically, scientifically, and historically, no essential relation, nor indeed a relation of any kind with the spirit after death. . . . The adjournment of the Resurrection for three days and three nights . . . was simply due to the *spiritual* incapacity of the Apostles to recognize *sooner than the second day* the Spiritual Risen Christ, though He was always present for those who could recognize Him during those two days. . . . Hence to regard Christ as a mutilated personality,

even for a moment after His death on the cross, is a gross misconception and a misrepresentation which has no other support than the legend of the empty tomb. To connect our Lord's Resurrection with such a gross physical miracle as the empty tomb, would make it impossible for thoughtful people to believe in Christ's Resurrection and in His full spiritual life immediately after His death on the cross.

Many comments suggest themselves on this extraordinary outburst. The last part of it might well have been what the Athenian audience said, after hearing St. Paul: it is precisely what Celsus did say two centuries later.\* And we might ask, too, in what sense the resurrection of the spirit only is less an "unintelligible event" than the resurrection of the body. But the point to which we wish to draw attention now is the author's treatment of the historical element. The New Testament process, so clearly described by Kittel, Sasse, and Sir Edwyn Hoskyns, in which the history controls the doctrine, is here exactly reversed: the doctrine controls the history—or rather both alike are controlled by Dr. Charles's own Manichean philosophy, with history thoroughly in subjection.

The Church's age-long belief, founded on the testimony of the earliest witnesses, that something *happened* on that first Easter Day which was *sui generis*, must give way to the belief that *nothing* happened which does not happen to every ordinarily good man. The position has only to be stated for its full absurdity to appear.

2. Doctrinally, Dr. Charles's position rests on two fallacies, which are the common stock-in-trade of Modernism. Of one, the "materialistic" fallacy, we need say little, especially in view of Mr. Mascall's article which follows. But space must be found for Sasse's criticism:

The whole Biblical presentation must appear to the Greek—as to the modern man—to be childish and primitive. It is only a question, then, whether this is an adverse criticism, or whether the primitive estimation of death and of the body is not the more correct one. This estimation of the body is accused of being materialistic. But the question is rather whether materialism is not to be sought on the side of those who value the body as pure matter. To meet the reproach of materialism, Paul expressly said that so far as it is matter it cannot inherit the Kingdom of God. But it is not only matter, not only *σάρξ* (flesh), but something more. Fundamentally it is neither higher nor lower than the *ψυχή* (the soul). . . . Above both is the *Πνεῦμα ἁγίου*, the Spirit of God, which is to be clearly distinguished from the natural *πνεῦμα* of man, the "ground of the soul" (*Seelengrund*), as it might be called. The resurrection is the summoning of the whole man, soul and body, from death to life in the spirit.†

The second fallacy is more far-reaching. It consists in the assumption that what William Law called "the whole process

\* Origen, *Contra Celsum*, v. 14.

† *Op. cit.*, pp. 102, 103.

of Christ"—i.e., "His personality, His birth, His life, His sufferings, His death, His resurrection and ascension into heaven"—\*— is not causative of an analogous process in human kind, but simply illustrative of it. Thus, the Incarnation did not originate the indwelling of God in man, but only focussed that which already existed: the Cross was not the ground of man's redemption, but the crowning example of the law of self-sacrifice which marks his upward path: Christ's resurrection was not the cause of our hope of eternal life, but only its most exemplary symbol: the Holy Spirit was not given from above in concrete historical relation with Christ's Passion and Resurrection, but is present with all men everywhere: the Church and Ministry were not divinely appointed or commissioned, but were evolved from men's social instincts: the sacraments are not effective, but simply didactic, signs. Different Modernists vary in the degrees to which this immanentist theology is pushed: but the assumption that man is the measure of Christ, and that nothing can be believed of Christ that cannot first be believed of man generally, is the underlying doctrine of the school. And that is the real issue which Modernism presents.

To disentangle that issue, however, is not to answer the question as to what is of faith in regard to our Lord's resurrection. This question has been the subject recently of an interesting correspondence in the *Church Times*, in which Dr. Major undertook the defence of Dr. Charles. In his first letter, Dr. Major contended that the empty tomb and the bodily resurrection of our Lord are not "of faith" because they are not mentioned in the Creeds: in his second, he claimed that primitive Christian belief tended to conceive of our Lord's resurrection in one of three modes, which might be described as (1) Resuscitation, (2) Transmutation, (3) The Vision Theory. The last-named phrase is intended to exclude belief in the empty tomb; and we cannot understand what evidence Dr. Major can find for such a theory in the records of the primitive Church.

But that is not our point at the moment. The real point is rather this. Granted that there were differences of view in the primitive Church as to the precise mode of our Lord's resurrection and risen life, does the Church's Easter faith involve adherence today to exactly any one of these views? And, similarly, granted that the tomb was empty, are we bound by the faith to connect that fact directly with the Resurrection, or are we entitled to regard it as a secondary, even accidental, fact which added useful circumstantial evidence to a belief already reached on other grounds?

\* A Short Confutation.

Now I do not think that the answer to these questions is quite so simple as Dr. Major's opponents thought. For all practical purposes, and on the issues presented, they clearly had the best of the argument. But I do not think that *all* the issues were, in fact, presented. What I have in mind is the position of Kittel and Sasse, which, while poles apart from that of Dr. Charles, is yet critical and agnostic on the questions stated above, while also, I believe, substantially orthodox. In other words, it seems to me that a negative answer on the question of the empty tomb is not itself decisive of Christian faith, but requires the asking of yet another question—viz., "What are you getting at by your denial? What do you think happened?" To such a question the German theologians would reply: "We do not know, and we do not think that historical research can ever tell us. What we do know is that it was a miracle, an event *sui generis*, which meant 'the summoning of the whole man, soul and body, from death to life in the spirit.' The records of the resurrection are good symbols of this, even though they are not historically reliable." Dr. Charles, on the other hand, would reply: "Throughout the New Testament we are dealing with the gross materialism of Jewish thought, which vitiated both the doctrinal and the historical ideas of the early Church. What happened was what happens to every Christian at death—viz., the liberation of his immortal soul from the body and its entrance upon a purely spiritual life." And, just as the first of these seems to us consistent with a substantial orthodoxy, so the second seems incapable of being brought within any definition of what is "of faith" in the Easter message.

As to what that definition should be, I doubt whether we could improve upon Sasse's phrase, "the summoning of the whole man, soul and body, from death to life in the spirit." Whether or not this belief will prove in the long run dissociable from belief in the empty tomb, one may doubt. I do not myself think it will be; and there is a good deal that might be said about Sasse's sharp severance between the spheres of theology and history, as there is also about his severance between those of theology and psychology. The compartments are probably not as watertight as he implies. But the Church must be chary of seeming to dictate to the genuine historian, who is also a genuine believer in the resurrection, the results which his research is to reach. The empty tomb is not the less a glorious feature of our Easter faith because it is a bulwark of it rather than the citadel itself.

E. G. SELWYN.

## THE NATURE OF THE RESURRECTION

MUCH of the opposition with which the Catholic doctrine of the Resurrection has met in the past and still meets today is probably due to the difficulty of conceiving the nature of the identity that, on that view, must exist between the body in which our Lord suffered and died and that in which He rose from the grave. It is therefore not surprising that theories, according to which the Resurrection appearances were merely spiritual manifestations or even purely subjective, though probably veridical, visions, should have seemed to many to be more easily acceptable than the traditional belief in a bodily resurrection.

In examining this question it is important to observe that those who attack the Church's interpretation of the Resurrection narratives nearly always do so from some *à priori* standpoint, according to which the historical truth of the Resurrection is something not to be admitted if it can possibly be denied. I have neither the intention nor the requisite knowledge to criticize the destructive theories of many modern critics of the narratives of the Gospels; my task is rather to test the soundness of the presuppositions which impel them to their task.

Of these presuppositions immeasurably the greatest seems to be the feeling that there is something unworthy of God in a bodily resurrection; that it is rather beneath His dignity to have any further use for His human body, and that a purely spiritual survival is more conducive to spiritual devotion and less patient of superstitious practices and beliefs. Such a view is no doubt a natural development from the scientific attitude of the later Victorian age, with its sharp division of the Universe into two mutually exclusive realms of matter and mind. If one adheres to these views, which, although they are rapidly being abandoned by scientists, still linger on in certain advanced theological circles, it is very difficult to conceive how the risen body of Christ could, while still maintaining its essential identity with the body of the Passion, be so liberated from the laws that ordinarily govern human bodies as to be able to pass out of the sealed tomb and appear to the disciples in the way described in the Gospels and the Acts. And even if we postulate that the material particles, the protons and electrons, of Christ's body are controlled after the Resurrection by different laws from those that held before, we meet with a grave difficulty when we consider the Ascension. For, if the risen body is composed of the same material particles as the body of the Passion, but taken up to heaven in a cloud, must we not hold either that heaven

is a limited portion of our material universe ("a place above our heads"), or else that in the cloud the human body of Christ was destroyed and only the mental and spiritual elements of His human nature survived? And of these two beliefs, the former is, as the Dean of St. Paul's has pointed out, repugnant to Copernican cosmogony; while the latter is even more offensive to the historic faith of the Church, which has always felt compelled to assert the persistence of its Lord's complete humanity.

But if we abandon, as modern knowledge more and more inclines us to abandon, the view that the Universe is a collection of hard particles, whose motions are normally governed by deterministic laws but are possibly (though improbably) subject to occasional mental interferences of an arbitrary and mysterious kind, it becomes necessary to examine the whole problem from the new standpoint, not with the confidence that all difficulties will vanish, but with the intention of discovering whether and how these difficulties change their form or yield place to others.

I shall therefore start from the position which I took up in two previous articles,\* and which I believe to be substantially in harmony with the general philosophic-scientific attitude of the present day. There the Incarnation was considered in two lights, in its relation to the eternal Person of the Divine Logos and in its relation to the created space-time order. It is the second of these that is important here. From our standpoint within the spatio-temporal process the Incarnation is the constitution, in a set of human relations, of a complete human nature, so that the Logos, while still the Subject of the eternal social relations of His life in the Holy Trinity and of the creative relations by which the Universe is maintained in existence, became also the Subject of that complete whole of human relations which constitutes His manhood as the Son of Mary. This fabric of human relations includes all the essential elements of human life, such as perception, memory, knowledge, intelligence, love, bodily functions, and the like. It constitutes a new mode of existence of the Divine Logos; a mode not essential to His being God, but due to an eternal act of free and unconditioned love towards creation. Christ is truly man, exhibiting at every stage of His human life the highest development in love, power, and knowledge that human nature at that stage could possess. He is truly man because He wills as God to become incarnate. This is the exact antithesis of the common Liberal Protestant view that He is God only because, and in the sense that, He is perfect man. In summary, then, Christ's humanity is that organic whole of human relations in virtue of which He took human form to undergo human experiences.

\* In THEOLOGY, December, 1929, and September, 1930.

Does this mean, then, that Christ's humanity is less concrete than ours; that, for example, His body, being merely the manifestation of certain of His relations to His creatures, is therefore in some way less real than our own bodies, which we commonly look on as substantial material objects? In fact, is our position semi-Docetic? The answer is emphatically in the negative, if we adopt the standpoint of modern scientific philosophy. From this standpoint relations are not mere abstractions, but are the ground of all concreteness; for the concrete existence of any object is intimately conditioned by its relations to other objects (and, we may add if we are theists, by its relation to God through them). The Universe is an interconnected organic unity, in which the mode of existence of any individual existent is the outcome of the relations that that existent bears to others. A physical object is concrete because, and in the sense that, it has the potentiality of mediating certain experiences to a percipient. The ultimate objectivity of the physical Universe lies not merely in the physical objects themselves as discrete entities, but essentially in the relations that determine their status as elements in that scheme by which God manifests His creative activity to us. Our bodies are the material things that we feel them to be simply because of the way in which we experience the Universe and react with other sentient beings. Our own humanity, in short, is constituted by our relations to the rest of creation, and hence Christ's humanity, which is constituted by *His* relations to creation, is just as real as our own. But, being borne by God Himself, it has all possible perfection.

Thus we must suppose that, when the Christ-child lay in the manger, both the bodily and the mental sides of His manhood were at the beginning of a process in which there was at every stage perfect response to every opportunity of development in goodness, insight, and power. In us finite and fallen beings true development is hindered at every step by the adverse influences of imperfection and sin, but in Christ the perfect progress proceeded unchecked. Thus we see the helpless Infant passing through childhood to manhood, responding fully and adequately to every stimulus, and manifesting, as the various potentialities of His human nature successively unfolded themselves, perfect love, obedience, wisdom, and power, till finally there was in His human consciousness complete apprehension of the Father's purpose and the knowledge of His own unique status. Then He set out on His great mission of teaching and healing, and showed Himself to the world as the concrete embodiment of what humanity at its highest can be.

Thus, as he proceeds along the path which does not only

lead to, but, in its own character as a process, is, human perfection, the physical, physiological, and psychological laws, to which from the start His humanity, because it is humanity, is subject, are gradually subsumed under higher and wider laws that express its complete adaptation as the instrument of the Divine Logos. Just as, in the body of a living creature, there is no abrupt violation of the laws of physics, but rather those laws are absorbed as ingredients into the wider laws of physiology, so in Christ the perfect development from infancy to manhood does not destroy His humanity, but elicits its true function by rendering it the perfect organ of His divine self-expression to the Universe. The reality of this development is clearly shown in the Transfiguration. In the transfigured Christ the system of relations which forms His humanity no longer manifests it as subject to the normal laws of science, but shows it to be governed by new laws into which the old have been absorbed by a process of continuous modification, so that the transfigured humanity has grown from its beginnings as a child becomes a man or a seed an adult plant.\* There is complete continuity of physical and mental life, there is no annihilation of Christ's manhood; but that manhood has reached a stage when it is entirely responsive to its divine Person.

It is in consequence of this that, after the Crucifixion and burial, the sacred body could not corrupt in the tomb. Our Lord underwent in His manhood in the most intense degree the sufferings which culminated in His death on the Cross, but His body had become so completely transformed on to the plane of supra-physical law that it was not subject to corruption. The Resurrection thus appears, not as an arbitrary interference with the course of nature, but as the apex and fulfilment of the life of Him in whom nature had reached such perfection that its offering of itself could redeem the world.

Thus the corporal Resurrection of Christ, attested by the empty tomb, is the guarantee to us of His continued existence, not only as God but also as man. But for this we should have to believe that His humanity in its completeness no longer exists, but that only its mental and spiritual elements survived the drama of Calvary. We should have, in fact, to view the material side of the Universe as inherently irredeemable, as something that not even its assumption by God could clothe with permanence, and all hope of restoration of our own sinful bodies would be lost.†

\* I assume the traditional view, which I see no reason to deny, that the Transfiguration was, from the standpoint of physics, an objective event, and not a mere subjective impression.

† I make some attempt later to deal with the fact that our bodies will corrupt and that yet we hope for their ultimate perfection. It will there appear that, if my

It is thus, I hope, clear that we have to conceive our Lord's risen body as possessing complete causal and mnemonic\* continuity with the body in which he died, although it is no longer subject to the laws under which physical objects manifest themselves to us in our ordinary experience, and in virtue of which we describe their behaviour by such concepts as atoms, electrons, quantum-variables, and the like. The former body is not destroyed, but the laws governing it have been woven into higher laws, so that the body whose functions were originally almost wholly describable in the usual physiological categories can now be adequately described only by wider and more embracing terms. In His risen state, the Incarnate Lord can pass through closed doors, can vanish from sight, can perhaps even appear in different forms to different people at the same time, so different have the relations that build up His humanity become from those with which we are ordinarily familiar.†

During the great forty days, then, we see in the risen Christ the greatest freedom of His body from ordinary limitations that is consistent with its remaining as a visible tangible object extended in space. Any further liberation must render it, at any rate normally, imperceptible to our physical senses.‡ Such a further development took place at the Ascension. The Ascension does not mean that Christ's humanity has been destroyed, nor that it is "in a place above our heads"; what it does mean is that its bodily, mental, and spiritual elements have been woven into such a harmonious whole by the indwelling of the Divine Logos that the physical elements are no longer perceptible to our senses as constituting in themselves a material object. Christ still bears in His humanity the memory of His earthly life; of his childhood in the carpenter's shop at Nazareth, His teaching and healing in the villages of Galilee, His betrayal

---

suggestions are correct, the uncorruptedness of our Lord's body will be the condition of our complete resurrection. The unique character of Christ's Resurrection, so far from being incompatible with the general resurrection at the Last Day, is the means by which this latter will occur. I may remark here that the persistent tradition of the Church that human death is due to sin receives confirmation, not in the sense that our inherited sinfulness results in a loss of bodily immortality already possessed, but in the sense that it prevents our bodies from ever attaining to that state of transfiguration and incorruptibility which we see in the case of our Lord. It is not *the property of being incorruptible* that our bodies have lost, but rather *the power to become incorruptible*.

\* I.e., continuity of mental life, especially memory and similar processes.

† This view of the Resurrection appears to me to be essentially reconcilable with that developed by the Dean of Winchester in *Essays Catholic and Critical*.

‡ On this view, the question as to whether any instance of our Lord's appearing in human form to a particular person is to be interpreted as an objective appearance or a veridical vision, loses most of its meaning. The glorified humanity need not be perceived in the same form by two people even at the same place and time, so any *veridical* vision of the ascended manhood is an appearance of the glorified body. The necessary distinction is not between bodily and visionary appearances, but between authentic manifestations and hallucinations.

and condemnation, His precious death and burial, His glorious Resurrection and Ascension. All these He presents to the Father in one act of intercession for the sins of the whole world, so that, united with the divine humanity, we may enter at the last into the vision of God.

Thus in the Resurrection and the Ascension we see not only a manifestation of the power of God, but also a revelation of the potentialities of man. The human nature of Christ, more real to us than ever, though no longer perceived by the senses, is a concrete example of the way in which human nature can be made to subserve the purposes of God. And we can certainly not deny out of hand that, with those who have journeyed far along the path of sanctification, their human bodies may perhaps have been transformed into something approaching what we see in Christ.\* It may well be, as Christian piety has loved to think and as history makes it not unlikely, that the bodies of many great saints have been to some extent freed from the limitations of natural law. There may be considerable truth in the view, common in East and West, that the bodies of the saints have often been preserved from corruption and have mediated the grace of God to the faithful in miracles of healing and spiritual enlightenment. If humanity can be so transformed by sanctity that it is no longer completely subject to ordinary physical and biological laws (and only the most arbitrary dualism can deny this as a possibility), we have solid rational ground for investigating the legends of the saints without being convinced beforehand of their unreliability. And if we believe, as so many of those who love the saints have believed, that the Mother of Jesus was preserved from all actual sin, can we deny that in her the process of sanctification may have conformed her body so completely to the divine will that it was capable of being taken at her death out of this spatially extended world into the presence of the humanity of her divine Son? This is not an attempt to prove that the bodily assumption of our Lady *must* have occurred; it does, however, suggest its possibility.

It is necessary to touch here on the very difficult question of the relation between the Resurrection of Christ and the resurrection of our own bodies at the last day. It is a commonplace of theology that the analogy between the two is not complete—Christ's body lay uncorrupted in the tomb, while

\* It is interesting to reflect on the feeling, so common among the Russian Orthodox, that all things, even lifeless objects, that have been brought into the sphere of the Incarnation in the services of the Church, have received a supra-physical character. Thus the sacred icons, since their character as mediating aesthetic experience has been subsumed under the far greater office of bringing the soul face to face with God, are felt to be, in no metaphorical sense, lifted from the purely earthly to the heavenly plane.

ours will decay—yet the Church has always felt that our resurrection, whatever exact form it will take, will be a sharing in the fuller Resurrection of our Master. I believe that the difficulty largely lies in the fact that we know nothing of the nature of the time-process experienced by a human soul after death; one may readily believe that the problems involved in the ideas of the particular and the general judgment appear to us to be considerable only because we conceive them under the forms of the time-process with which we are familiar and which is imposed on us by our earthly bodies. But, when all is said, the difficulty remains that the consensus of the Church demands that we shall receive our bodies again, while experience assures us that they will decay in our graves. We must realize, however, that the early Church was faced with the same difficulty, which arises, not from the theories of Copernicus or Darwin or Schrödinger, but from the elementary fact, as familiar to primitive Christians as to us, that, as a matter of experience, dead bodies do decompose. If, then, the Church has held to its belief in the face of this uncomfortable fact, we may be sure that the belief in question is deeply rooted in the Christian life and is not to be lightly discarded as of purely academic interest.

As a step towards a solution, I would very tentatively suggest the following considerations, emphasizing strongly their speculative nature and the fact that we are dealing with a realm of which we have no immediate experience. I have emphasized the fact that in a human individual the mind is not enclosed in the body like a bird in a cage, but that there is a constant interaction and interpenetration, impressing on the body and the mind a character of conformability to one another, so that they are woven into an ever closer unity. In the case of our Lord this unity is at last complete; even while the sacred body lay in the grave it was preserved from corruption by Him whose body it was, for His death was due not to any inherent mortality of His body, but to His will to die for our sins. But with us this perfect unity is not achieved; the flesh warreth against the spirit; our sins hamper the interpenetrative process, so that the physiological laws governing our bodies are never wholly taken up into the higher spiritual laws which might arrest the natural forces of decay and confer on us physical immortality. The body thus dies and corrupts, and the soul is set free, bearing all the marks of its past habitation and preserving its character of conformity to the body it has left behind. The purgative process begins, and the soul, enlightened and guided by the glorified humanity of its Saviour, more and more adequately equips itself for the sharing of His humanity in its final union with Him in the joy of the Beatific Vision. In this union it will

clothe itself with the perfect and glorified body of its Lord, conforming this to the character of individuality that its own earthly body, now long corrupted, left upon it, so that it will truly receive its body back again, not in any sense of quasi-material identity of physical particles, but, as it were, through reflection in the ascended humanity of its Lord, through whose victorious Passion the material Universe has been lifted on to a higher and heavenly plane and united with Him. With those who, in this life, have attained the summit of sanctity, the period of purgation may not be necessary; although their bodies, bound by past sin, may have been incapable of complete union with their souls in one coherent undivided personality, yet their souls, purified by long training in asceticism and prayer, may be ready to look on the perfect humanity of their Master and to find their home in Him. On the other hand, those (if any such there be) who in this life have deliberately and consistently looked on their Saviour and turned their backs on Him, and have of set purpose conformed their souls to the lower things of the flesh, may find themselves unable to respond to the vision of His perfect humanity, and, in their sense of utter loss, may feel so deeply and miserably the stains left on their souls by their earthly life that one may say, in no figurative sense, that they will receive back their bodies to damnation. But, without indulging a shallow universalism, we may surely hope that this can never occur.\*

If such a view as this has any approximation to correctness we can see the possibility of a resurrection of the body of no materialistic kind, but due to the soul, with all the memories of its earthly life finding itself face to face with the divine humanity of its Lord, that archetypal humanity in which, while still *in via*, we share imperfectly, but shall then in heaven receive in its fulness. "For now we see as in a glass darkly, but then face to face." Will it not be in the vision of the glorified manhood of Christ that we shall attain our own perfection, and through union with His glorified body that we shall receive back our own bodies as He would have them to be?

The argument that I have followed seems to offer a possibility of reconciling to the traditional teaching of the Church those who feel that a bodily resurrection of our Lord from the tomb necessitates a materialistic view of His present existence. I have tried to show that a complete and essential continuity between the body that hung on the Cross and the glorified body

\* I cannot resist quoting the remark of a leading Russian Orthodox theologian that it is not impossible that, in the end, even the Devil and his angels may be saved. Compare also the story, related by Zankov in *The Eastern Orthodox Church*, of the old Russian peasant-woman, who lit a candle in church before a picture of Satan, "because nobody prays for him."

now in heaven is possible without it being necessary to look upon heaven as a limited part of our Universe. Nor is this the reassertion of Luther's theory of an omnipresent body of Christ, for (apart from its presence in the Blessed Sacrament which I refer to below) we cannot describe Christ's humanity in local terms at all. The laws that express how our ascended Master is now related to us in His manhood are not such as to constitute a material body subject to the laws of physics and biology, but are such as to mediate His life to us in the fellowship of the Church.

And here it is possible to consider briefly the significance of the use of the phrase the "Body of Christ" to describe the Christian community and the sacred element in the Eucharist. Side by side with the withdrawal of Christ's manhood from the sphere of sensible experience there is the foundation of the Holy Catholic Church, the divine organism whose function it is to confer on created beings the benefits of the Incarnation. The relations of God to us and of us to God which are established in, and which constitute, the human individuality of Christ are made accessible to us through our membership in the Church and our communion in the sacraments. Thus it is by no metaphor, but in a real, though particular sense, that the Church is to be described as the Body of Christ. *Ubi Christus Homo, ibi humanitas eius*; the Body of Christ is "in heaven" and yet "here," for heaven is not a part of our Universe, but the state of existence, the mode of being, of the glorified Master; and it is "here," in the Church, that we are brought near to Him in His glory and made partakers of the benefits of His passion. In His presence throughout the Church, His humanity is spatialized, but not localized; it is revealed to us within the order of space and time, but is not restricted to any special place or epoch; it flows into the Church from above in the sacraments and out from the Church to the world in the lives of Christians, transfiguring creation and bringing it back to God. In the Church, the Incarnation is extended to the whole world, the Passion is made the sacrifice and atonement for the world's sin, and the world is renewed and restored through the victory of the Resurrection and the Ascension.

This torrent of grace, bearing the world along in the orbit of new life, flows from one special source—the Holy Eucharist. The Church has always believed that, in the Mass, Christ, in His ascended glory, is truly present. But one outstanding difficulty of Eucharistic theology has been to maintain a true and genuine presence, without opening the way to the notion that in the Mass the immolation of Calvary is repeated, and without belittling the presence of Christ in the organism of the

Church. Professor A. E. Taylor and the Master of Corpus have gone far towards annihilating this difficulty, and I am therefore glad to believe that my argument above is in material agreement with their conclusions. The essential point is, that the relations of the consecrated Elements to a believer are just those of the ascended Christ to him; the Elements render His sacrifice applicable to us; devout reception of them unites us with Him and makes us sharers in His offering of Himself to the Father. The act of consecration thus establishes in them a complex of relations to us which are the same as those relations to us that constitute His glorified humanity; it thus brings about a real and concrete presence of Christ as God and Man, or perhaps we might more exactly say, as God in manhood. There is no difference, except in spatial manifestation, between the humanity of Christ in heaven, in the Church, and in the Blessed Sacrament; all subsist in virtue of His relations to us as incarnate, crucified, risen, and ascended; they differ only in the mode of their accessibility to us.\*

To sum up, then, the Universe is an organic whole of relations of God to his creatures, and, through this, of them to one another. In virtue of these relations, the Universe is so ordered as to have the character of an interrelated structure of physical objects obeying physical and biological laws. The Incarnation sets up a further set of relations between the Divine Logos and creation, constituting His whole life as man. These relations are at first the normal relations between the ego of a baby and the Universe, but, being borne by the Person of the Logos Himself, they develop in perfect response to the will of God in a way that the relations of our sinful personalities do not. Christ's human nature thus ceases to be confined by the laws of physical and natural science, these laws being absorbed into a wider whole in virtue of which He is no longer restricted by spatial limitations. His presence in the Church and in the Eucharist is constituted by these same relations, but manifested under different spatial conditions. There is thus true and enduring continuity and identity between the body in which Christ died on Calvary and the body now present in heaven; between the body born of Mary, the Body which is the Church, and the Body of the Eucharist, for each is the ark of the same divine humanity. There is no question of identity of material particles. Material particles are not the irreducible elements of which the universe is made; they are concepts by which we describe our experience of God, and they possess only that

\* Fr. de la Taille, it will be remembered, lays great stress on the fact that Christ is present in the Mass in the same condition as in heaven (*The Mystery of Faith*, small edition, pp. 16 sqq.).

permanence that He has given them. But the human nature of the Son of God is constituted by His mercy to us, and persists when the material laws by which it was conditioned have been merged into wider laws than those of physical science. "The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us. . . ." "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."

E. L. MASCALL.

## MISCELLANEA

### NOTES AND COMMENTS

WE are glad to welcome the first number of a new quarterly entitled *Christendom: A Journal of Christian Sociology*, published by Messrs. Blackwell at 2s. The magazine is the organ of the League of the Kingdom of God, and is a direct outcome of the Anglo-Catholic Summer Schools of Sociology which have been held in recent years. The editorial hands of Mr. Maurice Reckitt and Miss Ruth Kenyon appear to be betrayed by their initials: Fr. Thornton contributes a powerful article on the meaning of Christian Sociology, while Dr. Demant discusses its prospects in America in the light of his recent visit there; and Mr. P. E. T. Widdrington discusses "The Coming of the Leisure State." We shall look forward to his development of this theme in subsequent numbers, and hope he will see the snag in it. "A Note on Gluttony" is timely in Lent; and a good Book Section concludes the number. The Editors will perhaps reconsider whether all contributions should not be signed. In this issue some are only initialled: and we feel sure that there are other readers besides ourselves to whom this is the most irritating kind of anonymity. However, it is a capital start, and we wish it *bon voyage*.

It is not often that we find ourselves in agreement with Lord Brentford, either politically or ecclesiastically: but we think a debt of gratitude is due to him for his rousing speech at the Albert Hall on the subject of conditions in Russia, reported in *The Times* of March 7. The names of Wilberforce and Gladstone were rightly invoked on behalf of the cause which the meeting championed; but we need not go back further than twenty or twenty-five years for events that afford both a parallel and a contrast to the present situation in Russia. It is indeed extraordinary to reflect that our country, which was stirred to its depths only so lately by the cruelties then being perpetrated on the Congo and the Amazon, should be so callous over what is happening far nearer home today. The fact seems to us symptomatic of a serious sickness in our national life, and we trust that it may be only a passing phase.

We have received an able and temperate criticism of Mr. Shebbeare's sermon on "Hunting," published last January, and we hope to print it next month.

The March number of the *Modern Churchman* opens with a most useful article on the problem of Sunday Cinemas by Dr. Major. We hope it will be widely read.

## LITURGICA

### (1) THE CONFESSION IN THE COMMUNION SERVICE

A CUSTOM has grown up of recent years by which the server leads the Confession in the Communion Service, while the priest remains silent and standing. This would presumably be defended by a reference to the rubric and by a reminder that the priest has already made his confession in the Preparation. The latter may be dismissed at once. The Preparation is external to the Prayer Book Rite and therefore has no bearing on it; besides, if the priest has made his confession already,

so has the server—in some churches the congregation has also done so. We may therefore confine ourselves to the rubric.

In "The Order of the Communion" (1548) the rubric was: "*Then shall a general Confession be made in the name of all those that are minded to receive the Holy Communion, either by one of them, or else by one of the ministers, or by the Priest himself, all kneeling humbly upon their knees.*" The alternatives are curious, but the meaning is clear. All, including the celebrant, are to kneel (the next rubric, "*Then shall the Priest stand up,*" puts this beyond doubt). The confession is said by a layman (presumably the clerk), or by one of the assisting clergy, or by the celebrant. No one joins in, as is proved by the rubric before the Prayer of Humble Access, said "*in the name of all them that shall receive the Communion.*"

The rubrics remained unchanged until 1661. At the Savoy Conference the Puritans asked that the Confession be made by the minister only. The Bishops met this objection to a layman's taking such a part in the service and altered the rubric to read "*. . . by one of the ministers, both he and all the people kneeling humbly upon their knees and saying.*" The layman was eliminated, but continuity with the past was preserved by giving this part to a minister other than the celebrant. For the first time, the congregation were ordered to say the Confession with the minister. The next rubric, "*Then shall the Priest (or the Bishop being present) stand up . . .*" (the reference to the Bishop had been added in 1552), remained unaltered. If the rubrics are interpreted in a legalistic spirit it is possible to claim that the Prayer Book orders the celebrant to kneel silently while everyone else in the church says the Confession, but that such was the intention of the 1661 Bishops is improbable.

At a time when nearly all churches were served by a single-handed priest, it is a little surprising that the Bishops preserved a reference to several officiating ministers as the norm, but a Bishop rarely takes a service single-handed and the rubric before the Absolution may have influenced the form of the one we are considering. The point may seem trivial, but some good people are offended when the celebrant ostentatiously dissociates himself from the people's confession of sins, and their prejudices should be respected, especially as they are supported by the Prayer Book.

The Anglican revisions deal with the problem as follows:

The English Alternative Order of 1928: "*Then shall this general Confession be begun . . . by the Priest or one of the Ministers; both he and all the people kneeling humbly upon their knees and saying*"

The Scottish Liturgy: "*Then shall this general Confession be made by the people, along with the Presbyter; he first kneeling down*"

The American Book has: "*. . . by the Priest and all those who are minded to receive the Holy Communion*"

The Irish, Canadian, and S. African revisions keep the 1661 Rubric unaltered.

W. K. L. C.

## (2) THE READING OF THE EPISTLE

Another modern custom which seems to have no justification is that of reading the Epistle with one's back to the people.

(a) *Sarum Missal*. The subdeacon goes *per medium chori* to the *pulpitum* in order to read the Epistle. In 1549 the rubric said "in a place assigned for the purpose."

(b) *Modern Anglican Modifications of the 1661 Book.* The English 1928 Alternative Order: "He that readeth the Epistle or the Gospel shall so stand and turn himself as he may be best heard of the people."

The Scottish Prayer Book (1929): "The Priest, turning to the people, shall read the Epistle or Lesson."

The South African Alternative Form: "He that readeth the Epistle or Gospel shall so turn to the people that all may learn."

(c) *The Roman Missal.* See *Liturgia* (Paris, 1930), p. 83: "At Low Mass the priest, to read the Epistle, holds the Missal in his hands; he has his hands joined for the reading of the Gospel. Observe the sub-deacon and the deacon at High Mass, and this difference of attitude is explained immediately. The sub-deacon himself holds the book which he uses; the deacon reads the Gospel from a book which the sub-deacon holds or which rests on a desk" (translated from the French).

If the Anglican authority for facing the people seems insufficient, the priest should face east with the book in his hands. But since the reason for turning away from the people is the heaviness of the book, and when Roman authority is followed the book must in any case be held in the hands, there remains no reason for departing from Anglican tradition. Dr. Fortescue describes turning to the east as an anomaly.

W. K. L. C.

### (3) NOTE UPON A PRAYER

The origin and authorship of that profound and perfect prayer "For the Inward Life of Jesus Christ," which the Cuddesdon College Manual gave to the English Church, has been forgotten. Here is the prayer:

O merciful Jesus, who when Thou tookest upon Thee to deliver man didst not abhor the Virgin's womb; vouchsafe evermore to dwell in the hearts of us Thy servants; inspire us with Thy purity; strengthen us with Thy might; make us perfect in Thy ways; guide us into Thy truth; and unite us to Thyself and to Thy whole Church by Thy holy Mysteries; that we may conquer every adverse power, and be wholly devoted to Thy service and conformed to Thy will; to the glory of God the Father.

In the new edition of Gerard Manley Hopkins's poems (Milford) appears this poem:

*Oratio Patris Condren: O Jesu Vivens in Maria.*

Jesu that dost in Mary dwell  
Be in thy servants' hearts as well,  
In the spirit of thy holiness,  
In the fullness of thy force and stress,  
In the very ways that thy life goes,  
And virtues that thy pattern shows,  
In the sharing of thy mysteries;  
And every power that in us is  
Against thy power put under feet,  
In the Holy Ghost the Paraclete.

To the glory of the Father. Amen.

After this, it only remained to find the Père de Condren's prayer. That, in turn, revealed an interesting history. It had been given by him

in the course of spiritual direction to his no less famous penitent M. Olier, founder of the Sulpicians. Olier writes: "I then learned for the first time and to my great astonishment, that Jesus Christ is really present in souls. I was glad to be enlightened on the subject of this great truth by my director. 'Yes,' he said, 'our Lord is really present in our souls: *Christum habitare per fidem in cordibus vestris. Per fidem*, by faith: that is, faith is the principle of His indwelling, and His Divine Spirit forms Him in us together with His virtues: *donec formetur Christus in vobis.*' He then said: 'Since this is so, henceforth you must unite all your actions to the Son of God in one of three ways: either by affection; or by disposition; or simply, by faith. If you have a sensible experience of Christ's presence, unite yourself to Him by *affection*. If you have no sensible experience, unite yourself to Him by *disposition*, that is to say, endeavour to have in you the same thoughts and dispositions as those with which He performed the same actions. And when you are ignorant of His dispositions or are unable to form them in your soul, unite yourself to Him simply by *faith*, that is to say, join in spirit your actions to those of the Son of God, which you will thus offer with your own.'"

P. de Condren then gave Olier a prayer which embodied the truth he had taught him (Thompson, *Life of Olier*, p. 58). It ran thus:

Veni, Domine Jesu [vivens in Maria] et vive in hoc servo tuo, in plenitudine virtutis tuæ, in perfectione viarum tuarum, in sanctitate Spiritus tui, [in veritate virtutum tuorum, in communione mysteriorum tuorum,] et dominare omni adversæ potestati, in Spiritu tuo, ad gloriam Patris. Amen.

Come, Lord Jesus, [Who livest in Mary] and live in this Thy servant, in the plenitude of Thy power, in the perfection of Thy ways, in the sanctity of Thy Spirit, [in the truth of Thy virtues, in the communication of Thy mysteries,] and by Thy Spirit overcome all hostile power, to the glory of the Father.

M. Olier left the prayer, increased by additions of his own [in square brackets] for the use of the Sulpician community. "This prayer," he wrote, "contains all the requests that can be offered to our Lord for the perfection of the soul."

Liddon, when compiling the Cuddesdon Office Book, went largely, it is known, to French Roman Catholic sources. The superb translation, though it slightly lessens the mystical sense of the prayer, increases its power for general use. Thus, this collect, so splendid in style and content, is no less so in origin; it is the joint gift to us of two French saints and one English.

E. MILNER-WHITE.

## REVIEWS

THE FLIGHT FROM REASON. By Arnold Lunn. Eyre and Spottiswoode. 7s. 6d.

The controversies between the exponents of Science and of Religion provide a wealth of material for such a book as that produced by Mr. Arnold Lunn, and the consequent danger of lack of discrimination is not easy to avoid. It would be ungracious not to mention the readableness of this book, even if that quality is obtained, as some readers may be inclined to think, at the expense of clarity of purpose. The book is full of good ideas, ideas which need to be emphasized in the large circle of general readers to whom this book will appeal. The author knows how to clothe his ideas in a way which renders them striking and forceful. The defect is a lack of co-ordination of the different lines of thought so promisingly started in various parts of the book. We can see what Mr. Lunn is "getting at," but we cannot see where he "gets to."

In the early chapters the rationalism of scholastic philosophy, exemplified by the writings of St. Thomas Aquinas, is contrasted with the empiricism which showed itself both in the religious thought of the Reformation and in the growth of experimental Science. It is tempting to compare the change in attitude in passing from the "apriorism" of medieval philosophy to the Protestant appeal to individual religious experience, with the development of the appeal to experiment in Science from the time of the Greek mathematicians until the work of Copernicus, Galileo, and their contemporaries. But the parallel is incomplete. In spite of the appeal to the empirical, Reformation theology remained essentially *a priori* in type. The rationalistic "proofs" of the existence of God were retained, while the results of Natural Science were viewed with increasing suspicion. This latter characteristic persisted right up into the Victorian period which Mr. Lunn considers, and was partly the cause of the apparent conflict between Science and Religion. For the exponents of Science were able to point out the contrast between their own appeal to experiment and the dogmatic attitude of the theologians, thus hiding from view the *a priori* elements in their own position. To deny to religious experience the least claim to the consideration which was allowed to scientific experience was the negation of the empirical attitude. When the theologians began to realize that religious faith was not merely a dogmatic assertion, but

a reasonable proposition based partly on actual religious experience, it was their turn to accuse Science of philosophical dogmatism and to press this accusation home until it became a conviction. It is no accident that "it is Newman, rather than Aquinas, who brings converts to the modern Church" as our author admits. Dogma is subject to verification in experience, and finds its most powerful appeal through the experience which it mediates.

The remarks on Victorian "rationalism" in the short but useful chapter entitled "Why Rationalist?" are illuminating. It was indeed "a triumph of audacity to persuade Christians to describe their opponents as rationalists"! But there is a use of the word which is honest, and it is necessary to be clear about the very real distinction between "rational" and "reasonable." It is possible to fall short of being rational (in the sense of logical), without being irrational. There is no excluded middle. And it was the neglect of this point which gave the "rationalist" objections to religion their power. Even if Science could achieve a perfectly self-consistent *corpus* of knowledge, there would be no justification for assuming that that was all there was to know. Other kinds of experience occur which have an equal claim to recognition. And, of course, Science falls short of her own ideal. There are many examples of inconsistencies and gaps in the scientific scheme, and their number and perplexity do not decrease. "Naturalism" is therefore founded on an assumption which is doubly false. The classical consideration of the whole question is to be found in Professor James Ward's Gifford Lectures, "Naturalism and Agnosticism," in which the matter is thrashed out. Mr. Lunn gives a variety of examples of the failure of Science to attain the ideal of self-consistency, but he does not emphasize sufficiently the metaphysical fallacy which underlies the "naturalistic" position. Even were there no flaw in scientific knowledge itself, yet still the claim to exclusiveness urged by "naturalism" would be false. Towards the end of the book Churchmen are rightly warned that it is undignified of them "to adopt an attitude of self-congratulation if a distinguished scientist appears as a defender of the Faith." The claims of Religion are no more true when scientists support them, and no less true if they deny them; and it is living in a fool's paradise to build the defence of religious faith on the moving sands of contemporary scientific theory.

Too much space seems to be given to details of personal controversy (particularly in connection with Evolution and Spiritism) which have no particular relevance to the avowed theme of the book. Again, the collapse of apparently well-

established scientific theories is not a cause for self-congratulation on the part of other seekers for truth. The author allows his criticism at times to be too purely destructive.

There is one bad mistake on page 165, where the argument for the existence of "missing links" is criticized. The actual evidence for its acceptance may be very small, but the absence of traces of transitional types (*e.g.*, between reptiles and birds) does not imply the necessity of their non-existence. It is not improbable that the relatively unstable transitional types may occupy a negligible period compared with the more stable initial and final types. There is no justification for the statement that we should expect that the known page of the geological record should "also on the mathematical law of chances contain some reference to the vastly larger number of intermediate forms between reptiles and birds." The objection is based on an unjustified assumption.

There is a trivial error on page 211, where we are surprised to read that an Australian scientist used a *barograph* to record a steady rise in *temperature*!

The real merit of the book is in its constructive suggestions. All experience must be "given a chance." We cannot deny one type on the grounds of the existence of another type. At the present time it becomes more clear than ever that the true apologia for Religion lies in the development and the study of religious experience. So will come an increase both in the depth of faith and in the richness of experience comparable to the increase of insight into Nature given by Experimental Science.

C. D. WADDAMS.

THE VIRGIN BIRTH OF CHRIST. By J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Litt.D. Marshall, Morgan and Scott, Ltd. 1930. Pp. 415. 15s. net.

If this large volume, the outcome, as it is clear, of many years' study and research, gains the attention which it deserves, two results are likely to follow. In the first place, from the strictly historical point of view, it will be impossible to brush aside the evidence for our Lord's Virgin-birth as though it were, obviously, negligible. Secondly, a change will be effected in what I may call the psychological climate. One has the impression that, from the standpoint of apologetics, defence of the truth of the Virgin-birth has been something of an embarrassment; it has been kept in the background and tacitly regarded as the supreme instance of what is often taken to be the one true approach to the miraculous element in Christianity, namely, that we believe in the miracles because of our belief in Christ. This

attitude of mind has not been without its truth and value; it has brought forcibly to the front the fact that the mighty works of which the Gospels speak are not the works of anyone, but of Jesus Christ. Nevertheless, there has been a lack of balance which has involved a depreciation of the significance of the miraculous element in the Gospels in relation to the doctrine of the Person of Christ. That comes out clearly when, for instance, it is suggested that even if Jesus was born of a Virgin, that is of no consequence to us; one could hardly pass beyond this in sheer superficiality of thinking. Of course, we cannot isolate the story of the Virgin-birth and consider it apart from the whole picture of Jesus Christ. Dr. Machen makes that very clear; but that is not to say either that the historical evidence for the Virgin-birth is of no account or that it is dogmatically irrelevant.

A detailed examination of Dr. Machen's book would mean a review many pages in length, and I must content myself with a general impression. Before he comes to the Gospel narratives he has a chapter on "The Virgin-birth in the Second Century." This is valuable as showing how firmly held from the beginning of the second century was this belief, and how little weight can be attached to a supposed different historical tradition and to the view that the "Gospel according to the Hebrews" contained no account of the Virgin-birth.

The next eight chapters are concerned with the Gospels of St. Luke and St. Matthew: specially impressive from the standpoint of literary criticism, with its consequences in the field of history, is the very full discussion of "The Integrity of the Lucan Narrative." It would not be easy to put more convincingly the extreme improbability of the view that there was, originally, no reference to a Virgin-birth in the first two chapters of St. Luke, and that i. 34 f. is a later interpolation. Very cogent also is the treatment of the Sinaitic Syriac reading in St. Matthew i. 16.

Two chapters separate Dr. Machen's examination of the Gospel narratives from his consideration of the theories which have been advanced to account for the belief in the Virgin-birth, if that belief is based not on fact but on legend. One of them is entitled "The Birth Narratives and the Rest of the New Testament." I refer to it because in it Dr. Machen shows a sympathetic understanding of the character and the restraint of the Blessed Virgin, on the basis of the truth of the wonderful birth, which is of real importance in connection with the whole subject.

In the chapter on "The Theory of Jewish Derivation," much attention is paid to the passage in Isaiah vii.; Dr. Machen himself believes that the famous words therein were a real prophecy of a Virgin-birth, but he lays great and legitimate

stress on the fact that the passage was not interpreted among Jews as pointing to a Virgin-born Messiah. He, further, and rightly, points out the unlikelihood of a legend of a Virgin-birth arising on Jewish soil. On the whole, today it is from paganism that the story, as a legend, is supposed to have made its way into the Church. Dr. Machen examines this theory, in its various forms, with great fullness, ending with Leisegang's idea that Hellenistic mysticism is at the root of the story, and that special emphasis needs to be laid on the conception of the child in the Virgin's womb as the result of the coming upon her of a prophetic spirit; the whole theory is very elaborate, but if Bultmann, whom Dr. Machen quotes, is right in rejecting Leisegang's affirmation of a connection in St. Luke i. between "the Spirit as prophetic spirit and as power of fructification," the foundation of the theory is destroyed. But, apart from the difficulties attending particular attempts to base the birth story upon notions discoverable in first-century paganism, the strongly Jewish character of the Gospel narratives is a most formidable obstacle to the view that the central point of the narratives is derived from paganism.

On the dogmatic issue involved in the discussion of the narratives Dr. Machen writes strongly, but, if his argument be taken as a whole, not unjustifiably. I do not believe that the Pauline and Johannine doctrine of the Person of Christ can ultimately cohere with the thought of Jesus as the son of Joseph and Mary. There is no ground for the idea that the Church could abandon its faith in Jesus as Virgin-born and still retain its faith in Him as the Eternal Son of God.

On particular points of interpretation and of historical reconstruction readers who agree with Dr. Machen in his main thesis will, probably, part company with him; and his conception of the authority of the Bible may be very different from theirs. They will still recognize how deeply they are in his debt for a book which presents so fully and so temperately the case for a too much neglected article of the historic Christian creed.

J. K. MOZLEY.

**HISTORIA ECLESIASTICA DE ESPAÑA.** By Zacarias Garcia Villada, S.J. (Compañía ibero-americana de publicaciones, S.A., Librería Fernando Fe. Madrid. 1929.) Tomo I (in two parts). Pp. 391 + 376. Each part 30 pesetas.

This long-awaited work supplies a real need, and supplies it well. For more than fifty years Spain, the most Catholic of nations, has produced no history of her Church, and the work of

Vincente de la Fuente, which has held the field since 1875, is in very many respects unsatisfactory. The *Kirchengeschichte von Spanien* of Gams, completed in 1879, is very much better, but since his time a good deal of new material has come to light and a good many earlier sources have been re-examined. Some of the new material was used by Leclercq, in his *L'Espagne chrétienne* (1906), but the work shows signs of haste and carelessness. A vast amount of study has been done on particular aspects of Spanish Church history, and on particular texts relating to it, but this, too, has been almost entirely the work of French and German scholars. P. Villada, with a very comprehensive knowledge of modern research, sets out to tell the whole story from its beginnings, and his first volume, covering the period of Roman domination, is a contribution of very great value to the history of the Early Church. We understand that two more volumes are to follow—one on the Visigothic period, and the other on the Mozarabic period.

It is unfortunate that the author or his publishers did not choose a different form for so important a book. The division of one volume into two, without continuous pagination, is always unsatisfactory; and the books themselves are of an awkward size, and flimsily bound—although the paper and printing are good. Then, too, the indices—each part has its own—are limited to proper names, and therefore of little use. And why must Spanish books always appear with a list of errata? The work suffers also from its plan of construction, which allots too much space to some subjects (such as the Itinerary of Etheria), and not enough to others (such as the Council of Elvira), or scatters the information on one subject through several chapters. One admirable feature is the inclusion of several maps and a number of plates.

Part I begins with a long chapter on the traditional visit of St. James to Spain and his alleged sepulture at Compostella. Here, perhaps, the author is a little too careful not to offend national susceptibilities, and it is not easy to say exactly what his own conclusions are. But he does give the reader an impartial account of all the available evidence, which, while it hardly justifies the Spanish traditions, makes the decisive negative conclusions of Duchesne and Leclercq somewhat less convincing. For example, Duchesne argued that D. Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada, Archbishop of Toledo, flatly denied the visit of St. James at the Fourth Lateran Council, and Villada proves that the earliest records contain no trace of this. In the second chapter, on St. Paul's mission to Spain, the evidence is again fully set forth—with the exception of a few omissions in the list of patristic references. Here, however, the author seems not

quite up to date in his chronology of St. Paul's later years. Chapters follow on the "Seven Apostolic Men," the spread of Christianity in the Peninsula, the relations of the Spanish Church with Cyprian (*i.e.*, the affair of Marcial and Basilides), the organization and catholicity of the Church, and the "Christian life." In these we have remarked only one or two points that call for criticism. The title of "Archbishop," says the author on p. 207, was not used in Spain before the Moorish invasion; but Quiricus of Barcelona addressed Ildefonse of Toledo by it about 657. Again, the reference to Bachiarius as a monk (p. 222, repeated in Part II, p. 102) disregards the study to which that enigmatical personality has been subjected. In the chapter on the persecutions we are given a valuable new text of the *Passio* of S. Marcellus—printed in full in the appendices—which is undoubtedly earlier than any hitherto known. The vexed question of the two Eulalias, of Barcelona and Mérida, is especially well handled, and cogent reasons are given for rejecting the identification of the two proposed by Moretus and generally accepted outside of Spain—*e.g.*, in Cabrol's *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie*.

Without discussing the point, Villada places the Council of Elvira after the persecution under Diocletian—*i.e.*, about 306. Of course, many writers have accepted this date, but it is now more general to place the Council in 300, before the persecution, and the older view is not easy to justify. On the whole, our author's account of Elvira is the weakest part of his book, and it is a pity that he did not take the opportunity to provide a critical text of the canons, which is much to be desired. A knowledge of Watkins' *History of Penance* would have been here of great assistance. Villada seems to imagine that the system of auricular confession was in full swing at the beginning of the fourth century, and his attempts to explain away the rigorism of Elvira are very far from successful, since he appears not to know that it was a belated survival of the earlier discipline of the Church.

The second part opens with an excellent chapter on Hosius—with again one or two inaccuracies in chronology. The story of Hosius' apostasy at Sirmium has been generally accepted without any very critical examination of its sources; Villada (following a hint from Duchesne) very plausibly points out that the report could originally have come only from the Arians, who were quite ready to lie in their own interests, that Hilary and Athanasius (if indeed Athanasius wrote the pertinent passages) were in no position to verify it, and that it seemed improbable to some contemporaries. He might here have made more of the testimony of Augustine, who asserts bluntly that Spain was

deceived about its great bishop. Another valuable chapter is devoted to Gregory of Elvira and the works which modern scholarship has restored to him with some degree of certainty. The problems involved in the presence of Gregory at Rimini and in his association with the Luciferians still require elucidation, but Villada does real service in drawing attention to the theological precision and literary charm of his writings.

Chapter IV, on the first heresies in Spain, has an important section on the archæological remains of Gnosticism. It also makes highly improbable the identification suggested by Babut between Delphidius, the orator of Bordeaux, and the Elpidius who is named as the teacher of Priscillian. Students of Priscillianism have found, in more respects than one, that Babut's work must be read with caution, and they cannot but be grateful for this fresh treatment of the whole complicated subject. It may now be taken as established that Priscillian and his followers suffered not for heresy, but for the practice of magic, that the intervention of the secular power was of Priscillian's own seeking, and that his teaching was, in fact, tainted with Gnosticism and Sabellianism. We may point out here that Villada's rendering of a passage from Orosius (p. 116) is not quite accurate.

The remaining chapters are devoted to Juvenius, Prudentius, Theodosius, Damasus (maintaining the latter's Spanish nationality), Orosius, and Etheria—a disproportionately long account of her voyage to the Holy Places. A very interesting final chapter describes the archæological remains of Christianity in Roman Spain, and two appendices give the bibliography—not quite complete—of Priscillianism and of Prudentius.

W. S. PORTER.

## NOTICES

**ECCLESIA ANGLICANA.** By G. F. Pollard, M.A. Rivingtons. 6s. net.

In this book of 387 pages, written from the Catholic point of view, the author deals with the history, characteristics, constitution, and future of the Church of England. He begins with a brief historical sketch, and then proceeds to deal with the organization of the Church. He next answers the question What are the characteristics of the Anglican Church? It is Catholic, Evangelical, Liberal, Reformed, Sacramental, Sacerdotal, Comprehensive, National and Established. Mr. Pollard then states the case for and against disestablishment. Disestablishment would be, he says, a great price to pay for freedom, but it will be worth while to pay it if the State denies the Church simple justice. The next chapter explains the true meaning of the expression *Via Media*, and the concluding one discusses the question of the validity of Anglican Orders. Other chapters are on the faults of the Church and the need for internal unity. Given internal unity and intercommunion with the

Eastern Church it may be that the "Free Churches" will, one by one, return to their mother, and that, in the end, "even proud Rome will seek admission to this great federation of the Churches, on our terms, not hers." Evidently Mr. Pollard is an optimist. H. W. FULFORD.

SELECTED POEMS OF WILLIAM ALEXANDER AND CECIL FRANCES ALEXANDER. Edited by A. P. Graves, D. Litt. S.C.P.K. Price 3s. 6d.

A thousand thanks are due to Dr. Graves for recapturing for this generation the fragrance of two lovely lives and the sense of beauty that informed them.

"Once in royal David's city" and "There is a green hill far away" have inspired us in our childhood and comforted us in our latter days, but these are only two of the splendid hymns of Frances Alexander, which we sing continually. Would you know the others? Then out of gratitude buy this book (the average price of a thriller) and count up these hymns. Amazement awaits you. Then perhaps curiosity will want to know what else this woman has to tell of life, its splendour and its pathos. Well, "The Struggle" awaits you, "The Little White Ghost" will haunt you. The grandeur of Beth-peor that saw the burial of Moses will thrill you. The Irish mother's lament will make your heart ache.

This quivering flame was nurtured by the love of another poet, William Alexander, Primate of all Ireland, her husband. He is the scholar who knows the use of words and weighs them. He walks with the steadfast feet of Faith gazing upon things divine and tells of what he sees afar off. But Frances flies to touch and handle a passing glory, and capturing it in a startling phrase brings it to earth. The two belong to each other in poetry as they did in life, complete as the two Brownings were in their day, and who shall measure the debt that England owes to Ireland?

W. E. LUTYENS.

DAS METARELIGIÖSE: EINE KRITISCHE RELIGIONSPHILOSOPHIE. Von Oskar Bauhofer (Geneva). Leipzig, J. C. Hinrich'sche Buchhandlung. M. 11.

The primary interest in this book is that it is the work of a Swiss pupil of Troeltsch, while the general standpoint is that of the group which one associates with the name of Karl Barth. The writer's object is to investigate the relation of the sacred to the secular, of worldliness to other-worldliness. He assumes as his basis the Christian experience, and therewith the further experience (which extends beyond Christianity) of a gap between the whole of human life with its course of events, and a certain element which seems to stand right outside them. All problems of religious philosophy, he says, converge in the end upon the problem, "What is the relation of these two elements—the given and the not given (or as the scholastics would say 'necessary being' and 'contingent being'), and how the former can be known by the latter?"

It may be said at the outset that this kind of posing of the problem is not at all characteristic of English liberal theology at the present time. Whether it be that its exponents are not keeping pace with Continental movements, or whether they are taking a line of their own, there can be

no doubt that, for example, the entire outlook of such a small volume as *The New View of Christianity* by Professor Bethune-Baker is totally different from that of the present author, and even the writers of *Essays Catholic and Critical* are tinged with what one Swiss writer describes as "Die Behauptung der ungebrochenen Finheit"!

Actually what one notices about Lutheran thinkers is the distinctness between their work and that of the scientific philosophers. In Great Britain our Gifford Lecturers lead the way in building a bridge between religion and science, and the influence of their work penetrates all our theology. Theologians and men of science are in intellectual contact in a way in which apparently they are not in Lutheran circles. But further, there is always, as we know, in German theology a strong primary emphasis upon the transcendent. It is hardly possible to pick up any systematic treatise on theology written in Germany in the last hundred years without immediately becoming aware of this. It is an absolute postulate. Even Troeltsch himself, who recognized fully the teachings of science and the relativity of our knowledge, had a keen sense of the supernatural as an essential element in Christian belief, and it was this which linked him in sympathy with his Catholic friend von Hügel.

Now the essence of Bauhofer's position is that as a pupil of Troeltsch he is painfully aware that the later thought of his master landed him in a hopeless relativity with regard to religion. Truth is polymorphous. All religions, including Christianity, have equal claims, and there is no finality to be found anywhere. Bauhofer seeks an escape from this into certitude by means of his doctrine of "Das metareligiöse," which we may perhaps translate as "super-religion," using the word much as English translators used "superman," as the equivalent of Nietzsche's "Uebermensch." A good deal of Bauhofer's book is concerned with philosophy pure and simple, but it is the theological implications of it which concern us here. The author takes up the standpoint that all our ordinary religious life is on the human plane. Even the two things that our fashionable theologians in this country are fond of talking about, mystical experience and spiritual values, are human creations. "Die Werte sind, in weitesten Sinne menschliche Schöpfungen . . . Werte sind sublime welthaftigkeit." Deity itself is beyond even the mystic's comprehension, and beyond description in terms of value. Similarly the demands made by Deity upon human conduct are totally beyond capacity to fulfil. This is where Bauhofer brings in Christianity. Our Lord, he says, is necessary to us as revelation in order that we may have some line of communication with absolute Deity, and His crucifixion was necessary as the act of absolute Deity in fulfilling its own demands of righteousness, which no human being could ever fulfil. In other words Christianity is "super-religion," that which assures us of proper relations with the "Wholly-Other," the "Transcendent Deity."

The Barthian character of this interpretation needs no emphasis, and one can imagine that the theory will find sympathetic reception in some circles in this country. But is it really sound? Is it wise to be always living in reactions? Granted that the swing of the pendulum is at present moving away from emphasis upon evolutionary immanence towards emphasis upon transcendence; is it wise to pursue the tendency so far that it lands us in the position of the Hindu who can only say about Deity, "Neti neti"? It seems very doubtful whether we are justified in insisting upon a sharp break between Christianity and other religions in

order to secure its unique character. The notion that something came into the historical series *ab extra* certainly saves much of the older orthodoxy, but it does so by insisting on an interpretation of the Incarnation about which scientific thought of the best kind feels an honest difficulty. One fears that, if we are to be taught this doctrine of the total aloofness of absolute Deity from the course of events, we shall sooner or later be told that, because we think scientific naturalism has banished the presence of God from a mechanistically ordered universe, our theologians have placed Him upon a kind of celestial top-shelf, where He will be safe from attack, and out of reach of scientific investigation.

There is much more in Bauhofer's book which is of extreme interest, but we confine ourselves to the main point, the intense separation which the Swiss school (of which this author is a representative) makes between Deity and mankind. What its future is likely to be we can scarcely predict. Plainly it is an attempt to recover that which recent years seemed in danger of losing, the sense of the Absolute uniqueness of the Christian Gospel and its bestowal of certitude. This, as another Swiss theologian (Brunner of Zurich) points out, is not in the least dependent upon a fundamentalist reading of the Scriptures. It is inherent in the Christian experience, and any view of Christianity which slurs over the fact that it certainly has always been this in its impact upon believers, is doomed to inadequacy. We doubt, however, whether the present movement from Switzerland is not, like other movements seeking an infallible guide, asking us to pay too high a price for the recovery of certitude.

A. C. BOUQUET.

DAS BUCH GENESIS. By Dr. Paul Heinisch. XII., 436 pp. Bonn, Verlag Peter Hanstein. M. 15.

The appearance of this new Commentary on Genesis will be welcomed by all Old Testament students who can read German. The translation of the Hebrew text maintains throughout a high standard of dignity, and the exhaustive discussions on recent tendencies in literary and historical criticism testify to the fact that the author, Professor of Roman Catholic Theology at the university of Nymwegen in Holland, possesses a thorough knowledge of the manifold problems connected with Pentateuchal criticism in general, and the Book of Genesis in particular. Moreover, by giving a more liberal interpretation to the resolutions of the Papal Commission of June 27, 1906, he is able to approach the literary analysis of the Book with an unbiased mind and without the *odium theologicum*. He frankly recognizes that in the first two chapters we are not dealing with an accurate version of the actual process of creation, and his criticism of the documentary theory, particularly from the point of view of the divine appellations, is stated *sine ira et studio*, using the same arguments as were put forth by scholars like A. Klosterman, R. Kittel, Eerdman and Dahse. In a word, the author is far from being an obscurantist, and in fact he gives in the Introduction an admirable survey of the history of Old Testament criticism.

The exegesis is on the whole both scientific and edifying, suggestive and stimulating. The volume is excellently printed, and forms one of a series of commentaries on Holy Scriptures, edited by Dr. Franz Feldman and Dr. Heinrich Herkenne, both professors in Bonn.

PAUL P. LEVERTOFF.

THE CARTHUSIAN ORDER IN ENGLAND. E. Margaret Thompson. Church Historical Society. S.P.C.K. 21s.

This substantial work is not to be classified in a phrase. It is remarkably full and sufficiently documented, a monument of industry, yet in spite of the clear style and abundance of detail it will hardly be found easy reading. The author appears to have yielded too readily to the temptation to pour out the whole of her material; with a better control of it she might have framed a better articulated and more impressive volume. As it stands, the reader must do the selecting and combining himself. One may be reminded of the late Professor Gwatkin's comment to the writer of an article composed of details strung together like onions: 'Wonderful! Not a detail omitted!'

The beginning, however, is the least impressive part, for precisely here Miss Thompson perpetrates a blunder almost sufficient to scare off any scholar. The title of *Part I.* is: "The French Origins": Burgundy to Savoy *French* in the eleventh century! This is found to be only too typical of the whole body of the work. The Middle Age from the eleventh to fifteenth centuries has not, apparently, been understood in any aspect except the purely Carthusian. It is a piece of work of the modern "specialized" type (Everything about my subject, Nothing about anything else). Nevertheless it is precisely the scholars who may be advised to read it, for it puts into comfortable English what the author has found in several large and learned works, mostly foreign, and they will not be misled by the bland assumption that one may cut off a joint from the late Middle Age and dissect it for an entire animal. They will have pleasure, also, in perceiving for themselves—Miss Thompson does not—how often the Carthusians shared the experiences of other Religious. Popes endeavoured to compel them to relax their austerities and to copy the ways of more commonplace monasteries. Like other authorities, ecclesiastical or lay, they found that increasing population rendered questionable their early plan of simply expelling unsatisfactory brethren, and they substituted prisons, with the idea of reforming the culprit, only to find themselves covered with abuse. Like other Orders, they first build in the wilderness, then in commercial centres. They send a colony to Ireland, which, like all other colonies in that human morass, immediately fades out. At least as interesting are the unique characteristics of the Order—their unanimity, staunchness, and preservation of their Rule (*pace* Miss Thompson, who makes lengthy exposition of the distinction between *Customs* and a *Rule*), and not least, their care for the spiritual weal of their lay brethren.

It is a pity that Miss Thompson has not provided a glossary. Experts will understand, but the average reader will be puzzled by a number of terms evidently bearing specialized meanings. *Converses* are amply defined, twice over. *Indults* and *diffinitors* are explained by the context; but what are the *Redditi* who occur so continually? The careful tracker will conclude that they were the same as *oblates* or *donati*, but also the same as *burdones*. Some are lay brethren, some in orders, some monks, prebendaries, sick attendants, or even married. Are they hired servants, or boys entrusted to the charity of the monks? There is ample room for some definitions in the too sparse index; the page references given are useless.

Part II. will be the most interesting section to the average reader. The

pictures of the English Carthusian Houses in Somerset, Notts., London, Yorkshire, and Warwickshire will delight every local historian.

Part III. consists of a very full narrative of the Henrician persecution. At the close of the book Miss Thompson recollects that "this book has not dealt with their liturgy," but the paragraph of mild general reflections which is offered instead is no compensation. The omission is devastating to the picture she has tried to paint, and, as she has incidentally described at considerable length the service—mainly of repetitions of the Pater-noster—which they taught to the lay brothers, the lack of any outline of their own service of worship is the more remarkable.

A. D. GREENWOOD.

A MEDIEVAL SCRAP-BOOK. By W. Edwards, M.A. Rivington. 12s. 6d.

The lively style and the well-chosen illustrations of this interesting book should win it popularity. Its modest title hides its definite plan. Mr. Edwards has gathered his "scraps" of different dates from a variety of printed mediæval sources and from modern writers on his period, and has arranged them systematically to give an idea of the belief of the ordinary mediæval Christian, English or Continental, concerning the Bible. Divine providence and wrath, Christ and the saints, the devil, sin, the last judgment and life after death. His other gleanings relate to preaching, penance and excommunication, the veneration of relics, shrines, and pilgrimages. He gives also a short account of the "two great ecclesiastical institutions"—the Religious House and the Parish Church which affected Mr. Everyman's life.

The author has not found it possible to give more than "a partial treatment" of his large and many-sided subject. But the features in a sketch should be as in a finished picture, in proportion. He might have shown something more of the real faith and spirituality and practical devotion which existed along with the undoubted gross superstition and credulity of the Middle Ages, and existed in spite of ecclesiastical abuses pernicious to virile Christianity. St. Dunstan believed in objective appearances of the devil; St. Hugh was an over-keen and indiscriminating relic-hunter; but no one can read their lives without finding instances of true spirituality, and of acts which could only be the outcome of vigorous Christian faith.

E. M. THOMPSON.

CHRIST IN THE GOSPELS. By Burton Scott Easton, S.T.D. C. Scribner. 7s. 6d.

Dr. Easton is a New Testament scholar whose learning has hardly won the appreciation in this country that it deserves. The present volume, containing the Hale lectures for 1929-30, given at the Western Theological Seminary, should serve to make him known to a wider circle of students. In a short compass he deals with the chief problems that today surround the study of the Gospels. He makes available for the ordinary theological student the results of much recent German scholarship and speculation. We know of no other book in English that gives such a clear and concise account of the most modern criticism. When we come to the author's

own suggestions towards a solution of the problems that he so excellently describes, we are less satisfied. His treatment of the Fourth Gospel is unsatisfactory. He makes insufficient allowance for the anti-docetic purpose of the author. No one shows more successfully than himself that the result of form-criticism is to show that we have no reliable chronology of the life of Christ. Why, then, does he proceed to build up in the last lecture an outline of the life of Christ which presupposes at many points a very definite chronology? At times he indulges in statements that can only be described as arbitrary, as when he states that Christ commanded forcible resistance in Gethsemane. No doubt his dogmatism is often due to lack of space. In short, the book is on many points stimulating rather than convincing. But the merits of the book, its lucidity, learning and critical ability, make us hope that it will have a wide circulation among students of the New Testament.

E. J. BICKNELL.

THE LITERARY HISTORY OF RELIGIOUS THOUGHT IN FRANCE. By Henri Bremond. Vol. II. S.P.C.K. 16s.

This volume unfolds the story of that mystical development which accompanied and was the predominant cause of the spiritual revival of the seventeenth century.

The interest to English readers is the wealth of information about the lesser-known personalities of that age and the clarity with which the author points out the relationship between the interior life of the spirit and the more apparent achievements of reform in morals and religious observance. Another point that is no less apparent though less obvious is the relation between the freedom of the mystic gift and the ordered strictness of the devotional revival which supported it, as in our gardens the beauty of the climbers could not be displayed without the straight and rigid lines of the pergola.

In order to "return to the interior life, in plain words, the practice of prayer, rules clear and precise, a method was needed." It was the age of St. Ignatius and St. Teresa: "They restored discipline . . . but in all this never lost sight of the higher aim of establishing the kingdom of God in souls. They fettered wills, but only to liberate grace."

The student will also value the book for the appendix, with its concise and lucid discussion of mystical problems.

The value of the mystic to others is rather in himself than in what he relates, as being a witness of transformed and illumined personality rather than being a teacher of abstract truth. "Their 'confused' light, the only one that properly belongs to them, is not the aureole of the doctors."

There is no attempt to avoid the dangers and difficulties caused by a "cultus mystical," and in the note on *pure love* and *quietism* the way is prepared for the consideration of the reaction against mysticism that is to come.

"It is evident that various mystics were not always able to foresee the the interpretations, ridiculous or dangerous, occasionally, perhaps frequently, given to their works by some of the faithful. The best souls understood them aright, but outside their scanty number how many weak wills and feeble spirits?"

Because of these dangers, should Christian people frown on mysticism and discourage its study? A careful perusal of this book will show how the mystic life is the fruit of the flower of devotion, and in an age of spiritual apathy and decay is the manifestation of the divine Spirit in the way of renewal. The reader will be struck by the strength of character, humour, and common sense of the characters portrayed, and how the movement is not restricted to the cloister and clergy, but is spread through every section of society.

It is a book to possess, to read and re-read if one would try and understand the secret of the mystics. The secret so simple—one requiring, above all, simplicity and humility to possess—the prayer which is direct experimental knowledge of the presence of God, His gift wherein the human part is preparation and response, and of which Madame Acarie could write, "One must search the deeps of the heart and see whether God is there, or at least whether He will be there, when the soul is prepared by religion."

G. SHAW.

THE EVANGELICAL DOCTRINE OF HOLY COMMUNION. Edited by A. J. Macdonald, D.D. Longmans. 7s. 6d.

The title of this book is somewhat misleading. It suggests a fresh exposition of the positive principles of sacramental doctrine for which the Evangelical school of thought desires to stand amid the difficulties of the present situation, an exposition which would indicate possible lines of progress and reconciliation in the thought and practice of the Church of England. These subjects are indeed lightly touched upon in the excellent but all too brief essay—much the shortest of all—with which Canon Storr concludes the volume. The rest of the book is almost purely historical in character. The writers take it almost for granted that we know what the Evangelical doctrine is, and on that assumption they proceed to trace down the centuries the history of an interpretation of the Eucharist which denies the simple identification of the consecrated elements with the Body and Blood of the Lord, and to emphasize as far as possible the continuity of that history by a wealth of learned quotation from the Fathers, from mediæval theologians, from Continental Reformers, and from Anglican and Free Church divines. If we allow for its more restricted aim, the general plan and method of the book is strongly reminiscent of Dr. Darwell Stone's *History of the Eucharist*. But an odd lacuna occurs in the history when we approach modern times. The history of the doctrine in the Church of England stops abruptly with Waterland. From that point onwards we are given only Dr. A. H. W. Harrison's account of the Free Church and Presbyterian interpretations. The whole story of Anglican thought in the nineteenth century is omitted.

The whole book, then, would be more adequately, if cumbrously, described as *Historical Prolegomena to an Evangelical Doctrine of Holy Communion*, omitting Anglican theology after 1740. As such it is certainly a mine of learning and information. It would be wearisome, and certainly beyond the powers of the present reviewer, to discuss the historical value of the individual essays. No doubt scholars of a more Catholic tendency will think that Dr. Macdonald and Canon MacKean have gone to the furthest possible limit in interpreting the doubtful utterances of the Fathers and of the Caroline divines in what they would

regard as a "non-Catholic" sense. Certainly it seems rather a bold use of the argument from silence when Dr. Macdonald states as an ascertained fact that in the time of St. Ignatius the eucharistic elements "were not yet regarded in a sacramental sense: there was no consecration or dedication either by the use of the words of Jesus spoken at the Institution, or by an Epiclesis, or calling down of the Holy Spirit upon the bread and wine." Moreover, Mr. Hammond's discussion of Aquinas is obscure in method, and not very illuminating in result. Though Mr. Hammond makes one or two valid points in criticism, the misuse of one quotation (for which no reference is given) does not inspire confidence. "To quote yet another passage," writes Mr. Hammond, "What is reality only (in the Sacrament), namely, the grace bestowed, is in the recipient." So then it is the appropriative element that is all-important." This will surely mislead readers who are not familiar with St. Thomas's technical distinction between what is *res tantum* and what is *res et sacramentum*.

Still, it would be ungracious to minimize the very real value of these historical essays as countering a claim that any doctrine of a Real Presence in the elements, akin to Transubstantiation, has been believed *semper ubique et ab omnibus*. We have in this book a full and forcible statement of the evidence on the other side, which is not to be lightly passed over.

But a few words must be said in conclusion upon Archdeacon Hunkin's opening essay upon the origins of eucharistic doctrine in the New Testament. The Archdeacon is, of course, entirely entitled to hold and to express his own views, and the Preface is careful to point out that the writers do not claim to speak for any organized body of opinion within the Church. But nevertheless it is rather a shock to find that leaders of thought in modern Evangelicalism can accept the Archdeacon's historical conclusions as an appropriate and sufficient basis for their doctrine of Holy Communion. The Archdeacon dismisses as probably unhistorical all our Lord's words referring to the consecration of the cup and to the new covenant in His blood, as well as the words, "Do this in remembrance of Me," and "Take, eat," with reference to the bread. The only historical statement left to us about the Institution is, "He took bread, and when He had given thanks He brake it, and said, 'This is My Body.'" "Our Lord's main intention," the Archdeacon goes on, "was twofold: first to encourage in His disciples the hope of the coming of the Kingdom; and second to bring home to them the fact that His own death was, in the mysterious purpose of God, necessary before the Kingdom could come." The breaking of the bread, then, as the Archdeacon makes clear, was simply a prophetic parable of the coming death. Not only was all thought of instituting a ceremony probably absent from our Lord's mind, but also all idea of a special communion with Himself in any way associated with the partaking of the bread broken. The early fellowship-meals in the Christian community, though reminiscent of similar meals at which our Lord presided, very likely had no reference to the Last Supper at all. It is true that in dealing with the historical evidence, the Archdeacon does not claim that it proves a negative, but only that it leaves us in uncertainty whether the Last Supper had further significance or not. But he clearly regards the uncertainty as amounting to a negative for practical purposes, and he even sketches a form of communion service which assumes the negative, remarking that such a revision would be welcome if it were made with general consent.

Two comments on this remarkable line of reasoning seem almost inevitable. (1) When a critic treats the evidence of the New Testament as drastically as this, it is amazing that he should find any certainty at all about what took place on any given occasion. The Archdeacon very candidly admits that the account which supports a more traditional interpretation was passed on to St. Paul, was not disputed when he emphasized its significance, and is independently preserved in St. Mark's Gospel. Yet he rejects it. The negative conclusion may be justified; but if it is, it seems almost absurd to claim *certainty* for those words of our Lord at the Last Supper, which, when they are deprived of any special importance, the Archdeacon is for some unexplained reason still anxious to safeguard. (2) Two, and two only, alternative inferences in the sphere of doctrine seem to be logically consistent with the Archdeacon's version of history. One would lead us towards the extreme form of Catholic Modernism, which would elaborate the drama of the Mass as an expression of religious experience, without reference to the actual facts of the Last Supper. The other would take us straight to Quakerism. Neither is of obvious assistance to an evangelical doctrine of the Eucharist.

Meanwhile we would advise readers who wish to keep abreast of the latest work on eucharistic origins to compare with Archdeacon Hunkin's essay Dr. A. E. J. Rawlinson's admirable paper in *Mysterium Christi*, and the relevant portion of Professor Yngve Brilioth's *Eucharistic Faith and Practice*.

O. C. QUICK.

---

ROBERT LEIGHTON, ARCHBISHOP OF GLASGOW: A STUDY OF HIS LIFE, TIMES, AND WRITINGS. By the Right Rev. A. E. Knox, D.D. James Clarke and Co. 12s. 6d.

One of the most remarkable characteristics of this interesting book is the ease with which the author throws his sympathy into the aims of those divergent Church politics which appeared in Scotland during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In the opening chapter the account of the principles of the Scottish Reformers is so favourable that a reader might well imagine he had a Presbyterian for his guide. In later chapters, however, this impression is dissipated, for Bishop Knox leaves his readers in no doubt as to the petty tyranny and ignorance generated by a system which was based upon a mistaken conception of Holy Scripture. Bishop Knox writes with understanding and appreciation of the gallant efforts of Leighton to allay the suspicions of the Covenanters of the West. Nor does he withhold his tribute of admiration from the most enlightened men of those bitter times, the Aberdeen doctors. It cannot be easy for an Englishman to make his way through the tangle of politics and religion in Scottish history of the seventeenth century. But Bishop Knox has equipped himself with a sound knowledge of the available materials. He possesses, moreover, the gift of clear and vivid expression, with the result that the reader's interest is held from the first chapter to the last.

The puzzle about Archbishop Leighton's unusual career lies not, as Bishop Knox assumes, in the fact that Leighton left Presbyterianism for Episcopacy, but in the misfortune that he was ever a Presbyterian at all. On this supposition the ministry at Newbattle becomes merely an episode during which Leighton made the best of a system, the weaknesses of which became more and more apparent till he escaped from it in 1652 to become Principal of Edinburgh University. Bishop Knox endeavours to interpret

Leighton from the other point of view, and consequently leaves the reader in some perplexity as to Leighton's consistency and motives. Driven by circumstances to be a man of affairs, Leighton's real interests were essentially spiritual, and in these he was far in advance of his times. His Commentary on the first Epistle of St. Peter is a spiritual classic, while his saintly life evoked admiration from all who knew him. His attempt to combine Presbytery with Episcopacy was a failure, and few will dispute Bishop Knox's statement that "the Church of Knox and Melville could not be fitted on to the Church of Henry VIII. and Elizabeth." But not a few today would maintain that the Church of Scotland is not merely the Church of Knox and Melville any more than the Church of England is the Church of Henry VIII. or Elizabeth. In that view of Scottish history lies the hope of an ultimate union between the Presbyterian Church of Scotland and the Church of England. Bishop Knox appears to have missed W. L. Mathieson's *Politics and Religion in Scotland*.

W. PERRY.

IRISH VISIONS OF THE OTHER-WORLD: A CONTRIBUTION TO THE STUDY OF MEDIAEVAL VISIONS. By St. John D. Seymour, Litt.D. S.P.C.K. 6s.

Archdeacon Seymour's earlier writings on Irish Visions and Eschatology and on St. Patrick's Purgatory are well known. The present work is a valuable and readable contribution to the history and contents of Irish Visions of the Other-World. The Visions here studied begin with the earliest which have been preserved, unfortunately in a fragmentary condition, and end with that of the Knight Owen in 1153. The author lays stress upon an important and highly interesting fact, which throws light on Celtic Christian eschatology. The earlier visions knew nothing of Purgatory as such. But, apart from the widespread belief in an occasional cessation of Hell torments, Hell itself had for some sinners the nature of Purgatory. From Hell their souls could be freed under certain conditions. This view is confirmed by other ecclesiastical documents of the period. With this went the belief that the final Fire of Doom at the Last Day would purge the lesser faults of the righteous. It was thus, in effect, purgatorial. These views were not held in the Anglo-Saxon Church, nor, indeed, in the Western Church generally at this time. Purgatory had become a settled doctrine, and it was believed that none could ever find release from Hell. Archdeacon Seymour thinks that these early Celtic views were derived from the Eastern Church. That is possible. Origen taught a similar doctrine regarding the fire through which all must pass, which did not harm the righteous, though some suffered in it who were not perfectly righteous.

The later visions, on the other hand, deal with Purgatory, as distinct from Hell, and here is seen the influence of the Anglo-Saxon Church, which reflected the views of Pope Gregory the Great. There were other influences at work, culminating in a twelfth-century reformation in Ireland which brought the Irish Church into conformity with the Church of the West. With this the Fire of Doom took another aspect. It was no longer purgatorial. The righteous passed through it unhurt: for sinners it was a foretaste of Hell.

The Celtic Other-World had now four divisions: Heaven, Hell, a place for the imperfectly good, and another for the not wholly evil. The two

latter were purgatorial. The form of these two states is derived by the author from incidents in that most interesting series of Irish tales, the *Imrama*, or "Voyages," these being partly Christian, partly pagan. The chapter on the *Imrama* is extremely valuable; so also is the discussion on the teaching regarding the Seven Heavens in Irish literature. The later visions, of Adamnan, of Tundal, and of Owen, are fully analyzed, and we are given many glimpses of contemporary life and belief.

The number of mediæval visions of the Other-World is enormous, and much work remains to be done in classifying them and showing their relations to each other. This book is a step in that direction, and the result of much original research is placed before the reader in a pleasing manner.

J. A. MACCULLOCH.

DIGGING UP BIBLICAL HISTORY: RECENT ARCHÆOLOGY IN PALESTINE AND ITS BEARING ON THE OLD TESTAMENT. By J. Garrow Duncan, B.D. Vol. I. The Croall Lectures for 1928-29 amplified. 12s. 6d.

Bible students will be grateful for this most useful summary of the results of modern excavation in Palestine by one who has himself done valuable work in some of the fields of which he writes. Once in the hands of the Bible Class leader, the book will be continually used for reference, and will be a source of real pleasure. Photographs and plans, clear and helpful, abound at every turn. We should like to have seen one or two maps, conveniently arranged, such as are to be found in Dr. S. A. Cook's recently published *Schweich Lectures*. We wish that the dates of the various excavations and the names of the excavators had been in each case clearly stated, also that references to other works had been given with more frequency and clearness—e.g., the references to Field 5, pp. 116 and 202, and to Field 7, pp. 14 and 190, will have no meaning for those who are not familiar with the *Palestine Exploration Fund Annual*, iv. We notice a split infinitive at the bottom of p. 181.

Mr. Duncan thinks that the cave with its funnel entrance under Zion may have been the זִנּוֹר *zinnor* of 2 Samuel v. 8, cf. Psalms xlii. 8 (verse 7, R.V. "waterspouts"). It seems worth while to call attention to the interesting suggestion of Dr. E. L. Sukenik (*Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*, vol. viii., p. 12) that the word designates a weapon of the trident class which would be useful in direct combat and in scaling operations.

Is it necessary to imagine in Jeremiah xxxiii. 17 the use of an oracle such as is described on p. 50, or in Jeremiah xlix. 14? The word שְׁמוּעָה "report," which occurs in this latter passage, does not seem to have any such meaning in the other passages, where it is found in the Old Testament.

We doubt if the existence at Kirjath-sepher of a jar-handle stamped "To the King Hebron" may be taken as evidence that Hebron was the revenue centre for the district, and that Kirjath-sepher paid its taxes to Hebron. The legend just as likely records the fact that Hebron was a royal pottery. See Driver, *Modern Research as Illustrating the Bible*, p. 76.

We look forward with interest to the issue of the second volume, and hope that the volume under review will obtain the wide circulation it deserves.

R. D. MIDDLETON.

A HISTORY OF THE ICONOCLASTIC CONTROVERSY. By E. J. Martin, D.D.  
S.P.C.K. 16s.

This book is published for the Church Historical Society, and is an excellent specimen of its new policy. [The Society did good work, at the end of the last century, when it countered the attack made on the English Church in certain pronouncements of the Holy See: such as *Apostolicae Curæ* and *Satis cognitum*. Its publications, for that purpose, took the form of tracts. When the controversy came to an end they ceased, and the Society continued in a state of suspended animation. It has now been revived, but with a view to treatises rather than tracts.] It now seeks to assist the publication of monographs, not of a controversial, and so ephemeral, value, but such as are permanent contributions to the scientific elucidation of forgotten but important episodes in the history of the Church.

The iconoclastic controversies of the eighth and ninth centuries form one such episode, and Dr. Martin has presented us with a study of them which is well-documented, clearly set forth, and of permanent value. Chapters iii.-xii. contain the core of this work, and his method is first to deal with each of the two stages in the movement historically, so as to show how it arose out of the circumstances—political, racial and cultural—of its own time, and then to pass to the theology of each period.

Perhaps the permanent interest of iconoclasm and its overthrow is centred mainly in the theology. The controversy turned, in the East, on the legitimacy of making and venerating a picture or image of our Lord. If God became Incarnate in His Son, then the Son of God became "visible and circumscribed and so capable of being depicted," and as to the veneration, images, according to the Seventh Œcumenical Council, may rightly receive "greeting and reverential worship," but not "the adoration which belongs to God alone." All sorts of other issues came up in the course of the struggle—"the independence of the spiritual authority" in its relation to the State and the relation of other Churches to the Roman See, and Dr. Martin gives adequate treatment to these, which are by no means dead issues for us today. But the essence of the matter, as he shows, is that the victory of the Iconodules did more than banish "a merely negative doctrine which might become, as it did, a fanaticism, but could never become a religion."\* It applied the principle of the Incarnation to worship: and showed that, since it is "the essence of the Incarnation that matter is not derogatory to the nature of God," the Son of God may be represented in art, and things external may be the vehicle at once of His approach to us and of our contact with Him.

B. J. KIDD.

---

---

### BOOK NOTES

*Women and Priesthood.* Longmans. 1s. As this Memorandum was prepared for the use of the Bishops at Lambeth by those who believe that women should be eligible for the priesthood—the Report shows that it proved unconvincing—it has a permanent value. The anonymous authors argue that Catholic principle need not rule out the priesthood of

\* H. H. Milman, *Lat. Chr.*, ii. 342.

women, although Catholic custom does rule it out. They specially desire "an authoritative statement that the exclusion of women hitherto from the office of Priest has been a disciplinary rule of the Church, not the assertion of an incapacity inherent in womanhood." Doubtless the Bishops felt that such a declaration was, to say the least, inopportune. Very few people as yet are troubled by the question, and until the diaconate of women becomes a reality, familiar in the average town parish, the problem is academic and not ripe for discussion. If the question should be raised in conversation, there is no need to cause irritation by speaking of "inherent incapacity," a phrase which the Bishops did not use.

*Westcott's Fear.* By a Disciple. Heffer. 6s. Bishop Westcott, influenced by Justin Martyr's account of the Eucharist, allowed the Sacrament to be taken from the Church directly to the sick. Nevertheless he feared the practice of Reservation. This interesting fact is explained at length in a book which, in spite of its admirable tone, is of little more importance than a letter to the Church papers mentioning the point would be.

*St. Matthew.* Edited by J. N. Pocock. *The Acts of the Apostles.* Edited by Sir A. Quiller-Couch. Dent. 2s. 6d. each. The publishers are beginning a new series of books of the Bible to be read for literary or devotional purposes. Each volume has a brief introduction and a glossary. Mr. Pocock's Introduction is evidently the work of a man unfamiliar with the recent results of scholarship. Nor is his glossary perfect. "Abomination (of desolation)" does not mean literally "spitting out." Sir Arthur's Introduction is very simple and avoids critical problems.

*Annus Eucharisticus.* By A. H. Baverstock. Short extracts from the Fathers for each day of the year, each dealing with some aspect of the Eucharist.

*Good News from God.* By the Bishop of London. Longmans. 3s. 6d. The Bishop's sermons preached in North London during his 1930 Lenten Mission.

*Sermon Psychology.* By E. Parry. Hunter and Longhurst. 2s. 6d. This has the freshness one would expect in a Borneo missionary, and will doubtless help young clergy.

*The Essence of the Catholic.* By P. Lippert, S.J. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 2s. 6d. A tiny book of lectures delivered to Heidelberg students, with no little charm of both matter and manner.

*The Gospel History Examined.* By R. G. Griffith. The Orpington Press. 2s. 6d. A useful study book for Church Tutorial Classes, dealing with the Gospel history, as distinct from our Lord's teaching, on critical lines.

*Six Maxims treasured by His Majesty the King.* By F. C. Baker. Williams and Norgate. 3s. 6d. These maxims hang on the walls of the King's rooms at Sandringham. Thus No. 3 is: "Teach me neither to proffer nor to receive cheap praise." The author, Vicar of St. Stephen, Coleman Street, has constructed six addresses on them; according to the description on the packet, he "has conferred a genuine boon upon society."

W. K. L. C.

*Philip cometh to Andrew.* By Bernard Clements, O.S.B. Longmans. 3s. 6d. This little book is a mixture, but a good mixture. Dom Bernard Clements works at the Theological College, Kumasi, and gives us at home a handful of suggestive sermons with a missionary note. He also gives, by special request, the notes on prayer he gave to his students at Kumasi.

*Half-Hours with St. John's Gospel I.-XI.* By C. E. Blount, S.J. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 3s. 6d. "Text, Paraphrase, and Reflections" is the description of the book. The text is broken up into sections of five or six verses. The paraphrase explains, adds local colour, or expands the story. Then follows a brief and often very felicitous little meditation or application.

*The Significance of Personality.* By R. M. Vaughan. Macmillan. 10s. 6d. The author is Professor of Christian Theology at Newtown Theological Institution. Possibly that is why, in reading the book, it seems impossible to get away from the feeling that it is a text-book for a one-term course in Christian philosophy. He wishes to present "a comprehensive and self-consistent world-view, whose constructive idea is personality," and in so doing he ranges from primitive man to Bergson and Karl Marx, settles the rise of episcopacy in half a page and the growth of Hebrew religion in two. There are few technicalities, and it is not taken for granted that the reader knows anything. He is not required to follow an argument, but given statements of the history and content of a certain line of thought.

*Beyond Agnosticism.* By B. I. Bell. Allen and Unwin. 5s. The author writes from his own experience of the passage from scepticism to religion, and of the religion that "is beyond agnosticism, not below it in mental maturity." The culture of the present world is a "new-rich" culture. It is not too clever, but too shallow to know God. It has "abandoned a mature God for some crude and childish idols," which the age-old wisdom of Christianity has long known as the World, the Flesh, and the Devil. Some are "really athirst for reality, but afraid to drink the wine of Him" for fear of "journalistic cynics." The present trouble is that, for the few who think, science and philosophy seem to have led to a loss of any sense of direction and purpose in life. Have we, perhaps, ways of knowing a purpose beyond reason, which can be developed without denying its validity? "Christianity is a plus to science and philosophy." But it can only be known by real experiment, not by preliminary dialectic. It has its "three great techniques"—Prayer, Sacraments, and Worship. But "the God worshipped in most churches is not a big enough God, not by a very great deal." A "chatty, friendly little group, having a nice conversazione with deity," is not going to be worth while to any seeking agnostic. He needs the fullness of the sacraments and of the Cross to enable him to face life and death, and to turn pain and sorrow into creative forces. This is a hard-hitting and interesting book, American in the best sense.

M. D. R. W.

*Institutiones Liturgicae in Seminariorum Usum.* Per Franciscus Stella. Tertius Editio, ab aliquibus eiusdem Congregationis Presbyteris emendata. Tom. I.: De Liturgia in Genere. De Sacramentis et Sacramentalibus. Rome. L. 6.50, 9.00. The young priest, Fr. Stella asserts, often leaves the seminary full of abstruse liturgical knowledge, but quite ignorant of

how to recite the breviary, to say Mass, or to carry out his other ecclesiastical duties. "He feels himself so completely tied up that he can find no way out." This would have seemed almost incredible if we had it on lesser authority. The present volume with its companion should certainly serve to remove any such reproach.

*A Directory of Ceremonial.* Part II. Alcuin Club Tracts. Oxford University Press. 3s. This will be a most useful book for clergy who use the ancient English ceremonial. It provides the practical details of the special liturgical observances of the Christian year, including the Veneration of the Cross on Good Friday (but not the Mass of the Pre-sanctified), and also the blessing of the new fire and the lighting of the Paschal candle on Easter Eve. The name of the Alcuin Club is enough to vouch for the accuracy of ceremonial detail: but there is a curious statement that "it has *always* been the Church's custom to have one celebration only" of the Eucharist on Maundy Thursday. St. Augustine speaks of the oblation being celebrated twice on this day. Dom Cabrol and Dom Schuster both assert that in ancient times there were three Masses.

K. D. M.

*The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges.* 1 and 2 Samuel. By A. F. Kirkpatrick, D.D. New edition. Cambridge University Press. 6s. 6d each. These two books appeared first in 1880 and have been many times reprinted. Their author has now revised them exactly fifty years after their first publication. During this period they have been in constant use as school text-books; and the object of the present revision is to extend their period of usefulness by bringing them into line with modern critical research. The Dean has indicated the sources which are thought to underlie the books, and has made many references to modern discussions of comparative religion and sociology. This has been done without attempting any detailed analysis or speculative reconstruction. The books remain a simple companion to the English version.

*Thoughts of the Curé D'Ars.* Burns Oates and Washbourne. 2s. 6d. This little book contains one extract from the sayings of the Curé D'Ars for each day of the year. Those who have made friends with St. Jean Vianney will appreciate the simplicity and piety of these thoughts.

*Parables and Precepts.* By the Rev. James Wareham. Mowbray. 3s. 6d. This book of illustrations for preaching is an admirable example of its kind. The precepts are short extracts from the writings of great spiritual teachers, and even by themselves would be a valuable little collection. These precepts occupy the left-hand pages of the book: opposite them appear the parables, which are of the author's own making. The parables are short and just convey the required point: there is much skill used in the pithy telling of them and just the right kind and amount of humour. Those who have experienced Mr. Wareham as a conductor of retreats will know what to expect and will not be disappointed.

A. R. B.-W.